THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THIRD SERIES—VOL. IX.—(XXIX).—AUGUST, 1903.—NO. 2

IN TRIBUNALI.

AN open acknowledgment of sin is an aid to virtue. It is a courageous declaration of the truth. As Sacred Scripture says, if any one denies that he is a sinner he is a liar and the truth is not in him; but if, like the wayward younger son in the Gospel, he gets up and goes to his father and says to him, "Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before Thee, I am no longer fit to be called Thy son," his confession will be rewarded, and life, vigor and a robe of innocence restored to him. "He that hideth his sins, shall not prosper; but he that shall confess and forsake them, shall obtain mercy."[1] There is a natural impulse in the human heart to communicate a secret to another, to unburthen a load of sorrow or suffering in the sympathetic ears of a friend who is likely to listen and to console. Hence non-Catholics and even infidels acknowledge the utility of confession. "There is nothing," says Leibnitz,[2] "better and more worthy of the Christian religion. . . . Indeed the necessity of going to confession is a deterrent to those who are not hardened in sin, and a solace to those who have fallen, so that *I look upon a pious, grave and prudent confessor as a powerful agent for the salvation of souls;* because his advice helps to regulate the affections, to disclose defects, to obviate occasions of sin, to bring about restitution, to solve doubts, to encourage the afflicted, in a word to dissipate

[1] Prov.: 28: 13.

[2] *Systema Theologicum*, p. 270.

or diminish all evils. And as there is scarcely anything more valuable in life than a faithful friend, how inestimable does he not become when inviolably bound by a divine sacrament to keep his trust and give his help."

Very many Protestant writers admit the advantages of confession, even though they generally deny its necessity. It ought to be regarded "*as a privilege of the faithful*," says one, "*as the best means of refreshing the soul*," says another,[3] and as a practice, says the Anglican Church, "to which all communicants are *exhorted* who have been guilty of sins which disquiet their consciences," and to which "every sick person is to be *moved*, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter." It is not surprising, therefore, that many Protestants have resumed and are resuming a practice which is dictated by reason itself, and which, as they have begun to see, was never relinquished in the East by the many sects, such as Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and schismatics, who apostatized from the Catholic Church in the early centuries. A priest no doubt is a mere man like ourselves, surrounded with infirmity, but for that very reason he is able to have sympathy and compassion for those who are ignorant and who err. In fact, in the hard and tedious work of the confessional he has no other end in view, no pecuniary or temporal advantage to gain—his sole motive in sitting for hours in a narrow cell is to listen patiently to an oft-told tale of woe, to pour oil and wine into the wounds of waylaid travellers, to point out remedies for every malady—in one word, to be the father of the prodigal child, to be the ambassador and spokesman of Jesus Christ and in His Name to say to all: *Come to me, you who labor and are heavily laden and you will find rest for your souls.* . . .

In spite of the manifold advantages of confession, there are many who find it hard and painful to disclose their shortcomings, even to a priest whom they never met and are never likely to know. They are held back altogether or tempted to partial concealment by fears and feelings which confessors ought not to belittle or ignore. There is the fear of losing the esteem and good opinion of a priest; . . . the fear of being treated harshly, of being questioned severely, and of being refused absolution;

[3] Canon Liddon, *Letters*, March, 1883.

the feeling of shame and timidity which many persons, especially of the gentler sex and the young, experience in admitting transgressions of the sixth commandment. These fears and feelings may be groundless, but they are deep-seated, they spring from pride and human respect, they often sterilize confession, and they explain the saying of Bellarmine that the hardest precept of the Christian religion is the precept of confession.[4] No doubt priests and nuns and others who are accustomed from their earliest years to frequent week after week the Tribunal of Penance, do not know and cannot realize without reflection the repugnance and difficulties felt by those who only rarely come to lay bare their wounds. Whatever therefore tends *to ease the hardship of confession* should be carefully cultivated, just as everything should be avoided which would aggravate its intrinsic difficulty. Not to become *too familiar* with one's flock, never to take stock of penitents sitting round the confessional, not to gaze at or seem to recognize a penitent, not to show any surprise at what is confessed, to shape questions in such a way that a penitent need only say 'Yes, Father,' all these are points to be attended to. And on the other hand, a confessor is never justified in using any harshness or impatience of manner either in word or look; rather is it his duty to encourage a penitent with a kind word, to anticipate his misgivings, to inspire confidence, and to manifest a readiness to assist with questions in whole or in part. Most people prefer to tell their story in their own way and thus "to relieve their minds," but at times a priest will be requested, and at other times it will be his duty, to interrogate.

On such occasions he must take into account the capacity and circumstances of the penitent and proportion the number and character of the questions to his obligation—in other words, a

[4] The words of the great Jesuit are worth quoting: "If there is anything in the Catholic Church that seems severe and difficult, without doubt it is confession. For what is more disagreeable, what more burthensome, than that all men, even the great and powerful, even kings and rulers, must declare their sins, however secret or shameful, to priests who are themselves men and must submit to judicial sentence and punishment? So manifestly difficult is this law of confession that it is quite incredible that the pastors of the Church would have dared to introduce it or would have been able to induce the faithful to accept and observe it for so many centuries if it did not rest on divine ordinance and institution."

penitent should be examined only with reference to those *serious breaches of his duty* to God, to his neighbor, and to himself, which are likely to weigh on his conscience. Matters that do not belong to the Tribunal of Penance, such as family affairs and the doings of others, are to be rigidly eschewed; and, in like manner, out of respect for the Sacrament, a priest should learn from the dictates of prudence and of experience to refrain from questions dealing with improbabilities or with minute and subtle aspects of sin.

Roughly speaking, it suffices, in treating with the ordinary faithful, to find out serious backslidings and every circumstance likely to involve fresh and serious malice of its own, or, as some would say, to make a sin "much worse"; and it is advisable to leave untouched such matters as the following:—certain *distinctions* as to number and species, for instance as to different kinds of internal sins, which would *worry priest and penitent* without any useful result; questionings which might *arouse curiosity, furnish the materials of sin or transform the bona fides of ignorance into the mala fides of disobedience;* and in fine, *all questionings* which would put an excessive strain on a penitent, and *render confession a torture* rather than a blessing and a comfort. *Moderate care* in finding out and acknowledging one's sins is all that is obligatory,—moderate too in the sense that it is measured and *tempered by circumstances of each individual case.* Hence a confessor must not require or expect the same accuracy from a dullard as from an intelligent person, from an ignorant as from a well-instructed Christian, from one who is ill as from one in good health, from a penitent hemmed in with a multitude of sins as from another who has not many to remember and explain. In general, it is better to omit many questions, better to let a confession remain very imperfect and deficient, than to put even one question which would entail serious extrinsic loss or inconvenience for the penitent, the priest or others; such, for instance, as danger to health, danger to one's peace of mind, danger of scandal or defamation. From the foregoing it follows that, though confession is both very useful and very necessary in order that the physician may know the spiritual malady and apply suitable anodynes and tonics, yet it is not essential; circumstances may justify a restricted or merely general

acknowledgment of sin, as in the moment of death; and those who are over-solicitous about an exact enumeration of all their sins to the very minutiæ are not always as careful about the more important and the essential elements of penance, namely, true contrition with a firm purpose of amendment.

In conclusion there are two precautions as to the form and wording of questions prompted by the respect and reverence which are due to the Sacrament of Penance. That Sacrament is literally a divine action, and the confessor listens, interrogates, and absolves in the very person of Jesus Christ. Therefore modesty ought to hedge in his words and restrain them from a vulgar or indelicate taint, without however rendering them unintelligible to the bluntest perception. And as knowledge—secretly and sacredly acquired—can *never be utilized in any way that would render the confessional in the smallest degree objectionable or disagreeable to the penitent or to others*, so, too, information must not be sought or solicited which has no immediate bearing on the penitent's conduct or which would involve the needless defamation of others. Hence penitents are to be warned and induced *to tell only their own sins* and never to incriminate others, and young priests are to be instructed that not even from the loftiest motives is it lawful to ask the names of those who have been partners in sin with a penitent. Both the natural law and the law of the Church strongly reprobate such inquiry as uncharitable, unjust and sacrilegious, and, even though a confessor should accidentally come to know the shortcomings of others, through the confessional, he remains as *solemnly bound to absolute secrecy* towards those others as towards the penitent.

In the sacramental investigation the only witness is the penitent. He is at once his own accuser and his own advocate, and it is a judicial principle to accept his testimony unless it becomes in some way discredited. Hence the very fact that he declares expressly, by words, or virtually, by coming to confession, that he is sorry for his sins and means to begin a new life, that very fact, as a rule, affords judicial presumption of his good dispositions and of his fitness for absolution.

This principle, however, admits of exceptions, for there are many cases in which circumstances connected with the penitent

may invalidate his evidence to a greater or less extent. Such circumstances may be want of proper instruction, levity of manner, a great attachment to sin. There are some persons altogether ignorant of the true nature of repentance. They imagine nothing more is necessary than merely to come to the priest and listen to his advice, or to say they are sorry and recite the stereotyped formula of contrition, and they do not at all realize that absolution and forgiveness of sin are just as impossible without a complete conversion of the heart, a thorough renovation of the interior, as baptism is without water or consecration without bread and wine. Other Catholics there are who, though well acquainted in theory with the necessity and nature of interior contrition, and though perhaps very diligent in finding out and cataloguing their smallest peccadilloes, are nevertheless so unreflective, so heedless, so negligent from temperament or age or routine, that a confessor is sometimes puzzled by their manner and sometimes doubtful as to their sincerity. Finally, a third and larger class of doubtful penitents consists of all those who are, or have been, the slaves of sin. They are held down in the bondage of some bad habit, some evil association or some external allurement to sin. Their will is so fascinated or so weakened, so fettered as it were at its moorings, that some ampler evidence than the naked fact of confession is necessary to make sure that it has lifted anchor and braced itself against the current with an efficacious and steadfast purpose. In all such cases as the foregoing, and indeed whenever the penitent's testimony has been depreciated and strong reasons have arisen for doubting his sorrow and his purpose of amendment—how is the confessor to act? Must he refuse absolution and send the penitent away to correct his ignorance, his levity, or his hardness of heart? Or is it not his duty to remove the doubts that exist and to awaken the necessary dispositions for the Sacrament of Penance, namely, a proper sense of its meaning and an unfeigned conversion from sin. Does not a priest sit in the tribunal to enlighten intellects and inflame hearts as well as to adjudicate and pass sentence? Would it not be cruel to send away, and sacrilegious as well as cruel to absolve, penitents who are doubtfully disposed without first making an effort to inspire that earnest moral attitude which alone can justify unconditional absolution?

No doubt time, patience and zeal are required for an effective exhortation, and in rare cases it may be an exceedingly difficult and almost bootless task to stimulate those sluggish or cowardly or despondent spirits who are always breaking their promises, always relapsing into the byways of sin. But the confessional is "the workshop of the priest," "the staple occupation of the pastor," and it is within its narrow compass that he reaps the harvest of souls, snatches them one by one from the paths of perdition, dedicates them afresh to the service of virtue, and clothes them with the robe of reconciliation. Whoever will not succor his brother in need hath not the charity of God abiding in him,[5] and the confessor who knocks off so many confessions by the hour and rarely gives an appropriate exhortation, neglects a golden opportunity of doing good and becomes a mere mechanical functionary. He is like a physician who hurries from patient to patient with the dash and ostentation of despatch, always indeed affording relief, deadening pain and soothing surface wounds, but never searching out the hidden malady, never effecting a permanent cure. Hence we have the saying of Salvatori that, from want of priestly zeal, confession becomes a sinner's couch to sleep in sin, so that absolution after absolution leaves them unchanged and unprogressive, while at the same time their torpid conscience is salved by outward shows and observance. Hence, too, Cajetan warns the ministers of penance to be more solicitous about the quality than about the quantity of their judicial proceedings. "It is better," he says, "to hear two cases well than twenty in an artificial and careless fashion." Better to leave many unheard than to unduly hurry a poor timid penitent who may go away dissatisfied, offended, or even still infected with sin. None of the faithful will ever find fault with a painstaking priest, they will all be anxious to get to him, and before long his plodding paternal perseverance will bear abundant fruits; the whole face of his parish will be changed, many a vice corrected, many a wandering sheep brought back, many a lost drachma found, many a dead child brought to life again. "Oh," says St. Pius V, "let there be good confessors and all Christians will be good." *Dentur idonei confessarii, ecce omnium christianorum reformatio.*

[5] 1 John 3: 17.

In theological treatises it is stated that a fervent exhortation may be included among the unusual and supplementary circumstances which often help to guarantee the existence of contrition. In other words, penitents whose sorrow is doubtful, who seem to be chained to sin, held in the meshes of some evil habit or occasion, and reluctant to break with the past, even such as those may be won over and set free from bondage by the earnest appeal of a good priest. Many weighty authorities might be quoted in support of this contention, but a few will suffice. And first of all Ballerini is most explicit and most decided in his teaching. He holds that a proper priestly exhortation will generally supply sufficient evidence of the good dispositions of a penitent, and refers his readers for an ampler exposition of his views to Salvatori's "Instruction for a Neo-Confessarius," a work on which he lavishes the most unstinted praise, describing it as of surprising excellence and value. In that work Salvatori, a most experienced and most saintly confessor, tells us that even though there may be doubts and misgivings as to a penitent's disposition, and though none of these reassuring manifestations known as extraordinary signs should be forthcoming, yet a prudent, compassionate priest can in most cases prepare the way for immediate absolution by unmasking sin and its awful consequences, and by inspiring confidence in prayer, confidence in sacramental grace, and confidence in God's coöperation with all those who do what in them lies. The testimony of St. Alphonsus is no less remarkable, no less conclusive. Many, he says, who come to the tribunal of penance *indisposed may be disposed*, by making them realize the ugliness of sin and what it involves,—an angry Father whose happy Home we forsake, whose eternal punishment we incur. I do not remember, he adds, that I ever sent away a penitent without absolution. Finally we have the solemn declaration of Leo XII, in the Bull *Charitate Christi;* first, that persons "who come to confession altogether unprepared," that is, unwilling to amend their lives, "may be converted" and made ready for absolution, "*if priests clothe themselves with the tender mercy of Jesus Christ and treat sinners with zeal and patience and meekness;*" and secondly, "that if priests neglect to do so"—"if they have no oil and wine for the sick and wounded for whose special succor they are

deputed, they must be adjudged more *unfit to hear* than others are to make confessions." Thus the Vicar of Christ teaches, no less than those other saintly and learned theologians, that marvellous results may be brought about, and should be expected, by every earnest confessor.

Under his fervent influence the penitent will be animated with a proper spirit, sin already robbed of its mastery will be put to flight, the returning footsteps of the prodigal will be accelerated, and all those who are not the slaves of sin will be touched with compunctious visitings and will lay bare their new and better sentiments. "Father," they will say, "I never realized my sins before." "I am really sorry now." "With the help of God I will not fall any more."

Of course those good results will depend in large measure on the character of the exhortation. It must be suited to the needs and circumstances of each individual penitent, not vague and abstract. It must be pointed and yet prudent. It must arrest the attention and keep it from wandering, by short, pithy, trenchant questions. It must grip the conscience by motives and reasonings and examples, and it must inflame the heart by prayers and entreaties and remonstrances. In one word, it must be living and effectual, like the Word of God, converting as well as enlightening, discerning the thoughts and intents of the heart, more piercing than a two-edged sword, and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit, of the joints also and of the marrow.

Perhaps some illustrations, mainly deduced from Salvatori's work, will elucidate our meaning and aptly terminate this subject.

(a) *Those in general who are hardened, weak, or cowardly.*—If a person makes you a promise, what do you expect him to do? Have you tried to keep your promises? Have you not often broken them? Will you not begin this time? If a man is sorry for offending another, will he go and offend him again next day? Have you not done what was wrong? Are not those sins ugly? Would you not like to give them up? Could you expect to enter Heaven with them? Does not a man dress himself becomingly before visiting a friend? Will you not throw off those ugly garments? For what company are they fit? Does not Jesus invite you to His Banquet? Won't you put on the white robe of

innocence? Is He not friendly to publicans and sinners? Does He not invite the heavily laden? If you love Him like Magdalen will not all your sins be wiped out? Is He not here on the Altar? Will He not love you when others forget you? Who has given you so much as He? Won't you begin now? Won't you turn towards the Rising Sun? Do you say you can't break off this attachment? Could you if this person began to love another? Could you if this person actually loves another? Could you if this person were struck with disease or with vile death? Is your affection, therefore, capable of change? Why love what is inconstant, frail, perhaps even sinful? Who is good but Jesus? Who is beautiful but Jesus? Who is constant but Jesus?

(b) *Holy Purity.*—Are not these things wrong? Would you let a friend, a mother see them? Are you not ashamed of your angel? Are not all things naked in the sight of God? Does not Jesus come into your breast? Does He not see your heart and thoughts and touch you? Did you ever look at Him in the courtyard naked and scourged? Was not His gentle Body mangled for ugly sins? Who loves you most in this world? Who has given you most proof of love? Who will come to you in Holy Communion? Where will ugly sins bring a person? Can you be pure without God's help? Will you not ask Him now to hasten to help you? Will you not touch the hem of Jesus' garment? Will you not cry out—*de profundis*—O God, create in me a clean heart?

(c) *Forgiveness.*—Would you oblige a friend? Would you refuse me a little favor? Would you refuse Jesus something? What more could He do for you than He has done? Have you ever treated Him badly? Ever done Him a "bad turn," as this person has done you? Have you betrayed Him ever? Has He forgiven you often and much? Has He forgiven you ten thousand talents? And will you not oblige Him now? What does He say from that crucifix? Will you not repeat His very words? Will you not say, "Forgive them, Father"?

(d) *Sins of the Tongue.*—Would you take what belongs to another? Would you put your hand in his pocket? Is not his good name more precious than his purse? How would you feel yourself towards a blackener of your character? Is not stolen

character to be restored as well as ill-gotten goods? Is restitution easy? Why do you swear rashly and call on sacred names? Does it strengthen a man's word? Would you let your mother's name be bandied about? Would you call on a decent person to go security for what's wrong and sinful? And why summon Jesus? Would you throw mud on the name of your dearest friend? Would you allow the Blessed Sacrament to be cast in a dirty place? Would you soil the paten? Does not Jesus rest on your tongue? Will you not keep it clean? Will you not keep it truthful and honorable? Will you not keep it from bad talk? Will you not keep it from your neighbor's character as you keep your hand from his pocket? Is not the tongue an unquiet evil, full of deadly poison? Is it not perfection to keep it in check? Do you bow at the Name of Jesus? Will you say from your heart—"Hallowed be Thy Name"?

(e) *Diffidence in God. Repining at Misfortunes.*—Is man's life worth much? Is the strongest sure of a day? If sinners prosper, what matter? But are the prosperous really happy? Is there peace for the wicked? May not a humble man be happier than the rich and mighty? Will he not take his rest sweetly if his conscience reprehend him not? Is it not better to die than lead a bad life? Were not the martyrs glad to die? Did they not long to be in a better land? Were they not innocent and yet put to death? Was not Jesus most innocent and yet the Man of Sorrows? Was He not calumniated and called names? Will you find such comfort anywhere as in the Crucifix? Does it not solve every difficulty? If God is with us, what matter who is against us? Can you not do all things with His help?

C. M.

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN EXEGESIS.

I.—Wide Range and Variety of Exegetical Literature.

THERE are some branches of study which are naturally confined to a comparatively narrow circle, and their very names are but little known to outsiders. But it can hardly be said that this is the case with the venerable science of Biblical Exegesis. It may be that only specialists can claim an intimate acquaintance

with its deeper mysteries. But we all of us have at least some general notion of its nature and its importance. Even the unlettered layman who has heard little of any other branch of sacred science must needs know something of commentaries on Holy Scripture. And he will, naturally enough, suppose that such exposition of the inspired writings takes a prominent part in any course of clerical studies, and fills a goodly space in our theological libraries. Yet it is likely that few, even among those who have some direct knowledge of the subject, have a just conception of the wide range and the rich variety of the literature of Biblical exegesis. Nor need we wonder at this when we remember how long and how industriously this field of learning has been cultivated. There are branches of science which have only sprung into existence in these latter days, and others which only flourish for a brief space in some favored localities. But the exposition of Holy Writ has engaged the attention of Christian scholars of every age and every nation. And we may well be bewildered by the vast expanse of its literature, in every language, from the early Fathers down to the latest productions of the modern press; from the voluminous works of Tostatus and à Lapide to the brief notes in our English Bibles; from simple paraphrase or dry textual criticism to dogmatic exegesis and mystical exposition; from the homely homilies of mediæval monks to the bold theories of modern higher critics. There is no age or nation that has not borne its part in the elaboration of this monumental mass of expository literature; and there is surely no form of intellectual labor that has not been bestowed on the text of Holy Scripture.

II.—Other Instances of Text and Commentaries.

At first sight it might seem a hopeless task to attempt any general estimate of this body of Biblical exegesis regarded as a whole, to find the principles to which it owes its origin, or the laws that govern its growth and development. But here, as elsewhere, the student may find his labor lightened by the comparative method. The various branches of this large literature, in many widely different ages and nations, may all be used to illustrate each other. And looking further afield we find that our exegetical literature is not something apart and isolated. For, as we

have lately seen, it has its counterpart in the varied and voluminous Jewish commentaries, embodied in the Rabbinical Bibles, the Talmud, and the Midrashim. Nor is this assiduous service of commentators confined to the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. The same phenomenon occurs in the case of the sacred books of other religions, or in codes of civil laws and masterpieces of classic literature or secular science.

Thus the sacred text of Zoroaster is commonly accompanied by versions and commentaries in Pehlevi or in Sanskrit. Sometimes, indeed, the whole text was gathered together without these comments, and the collection was distinguished by the name of *Vendidad Sade*, or the pure *Vendidad*. Yet in course of time this collection itself is found with vernacular versions and traditional interpretations.[1]

In like manner the two codes of the Civil and the Canon Law have offered an abundant field of labor to a countless host of commentators. The writings of the great philosophers of Greece have been systematically expounded by Alexandrian sophists and neo-Platonists, by Jews and Arabs and mediæval schoolmen. And the Homeric poems and the masterpieces of the Athenian drama have had their ancient scholiasts and modern annotators.

III.—Some Dangers of Commentators.

It may be freely confessed that some of these varied and innumerable commentators are often in danger of defeating their own object, and darkening or destroying the text which they would fain elucidate. There are some whose corroding criticism dissolves the whole fabric of the text it touches. On the other side, there are some subtle and ingenious interpreters in whose hands the simplest words can be twisted and tortured till they are made to mean anything. And even when the commentator avoids these extremes, and honestly seeks to bring out the author's meaning, instead of putting his own meaning into the text, there is still some danger that the reader may attach too much importance to the exposition, and linger in the vestibule instead

[1] *E. g.* the Bombay edition of "The *Vendidad Sade* of the Parsîs in the Zand language but Gujarâtî character, with a Gujarâtî translation, paraphrase and comment, according to the traditional interpretation of the Zoroastrians."

of entering the sanctuary. We may see some signs of this in much of the superficial literary culture of the present age. For, if we are not mistaken, there is an unfortunate tendency to read about great books instead of reading them. We should be the last to depreciate the true functions of literary criticism. But the critical essay which would be a useful companion to the works of Dante or Shakespere, will prove at the best but a sorry substitute for the writings of those masters. If this be true of secular literature, it will apply with greater force to the inspired writings. Certainly much of the time bestowed on the tedious and interminable disputes of commentators might be more profitably employed in devoutly reading the Sacred Scriptures. For this reason it is scarcely surprising that this should frequently lead to a movement of reaction. The tendency to attach an exaggerated importance to the commentaries, provokes an impatient desire to dispense with their services altogether. We see this in the case of the Jewish Karaites, who rejected the Rabbinical traditions; and in the Protestants, who profess to follow the Bible and the Bible only.

IV.—The Natural Necessity of Biblical Exegesis.

But, however natural and intelligible this reaction may be, and however desirable it may be to keep the commentators within due bounds and preserve the supremacy of the Sacred Text, it is idle to attempt any such drastic and ruthless remedy. This may be easily seen in the light of past experience. The Reformers of the sixteenth century might make short work of the traditional exegesis, and reject the authoritative comments of the old Fathers and schoolmen; they might adopt as their motto, "The Bible and the Bible only." But could this put an end to Biblical exposition? The answer may be seen in the vast and voluminous literature of Protestant exegesis. To reject the traditional commentaries was only to substitute one exegesis for another. Nor need this fact surprise us, when we once fairly grasp the philosophy of this exegetical process. It is, indeed, no arbitrary invention of monks and schoolmen, but a simple necessity arising from the natural principles of human knowledge. The only way of keeping clear of any gloss or comment would be to have the

sacred writings in an unintelligible language. For when once the words are understood, however imperfectly, the readers must needs compare them with other ideas already in their minds, and so penetrate, in varying degrees, into the meaning of the message. Or, in the language of the old schoolmen, each one receives it in his own manner. In this way, even the plainest and most explicit statement may suggest different questions to the minds of each one, according to the measure and character of his previous knowledge. It must be remembered, moreover, that Holy Scripture contains many passages of considerable obscurity. These present more than one perplexing riddle to the mind of the reader, and he is constrained to cast about for some solution. Nor can it be expected that each one should keep his own opinion on the matter to himself. The problem will naturally become a common theme of discussion. Less enlightened readers will be led to look for help and guidance. And the views of leading minds will insensibly permeate and influence those around them. Whether all this is committed to writing and moulded into an ordered system, is, after all, a minor matter. Written or unwritten, shapeless or systematized, a living and growing body of Biblical exegesis is a simple psychological necessity.

V.—The Historical Evolution of Exegesis.

Those who are acquainted with the past history of exegetical literature will readily acknowledge that these anticipations are fully borne out by experience. In spite of every effort to dispense with the services of the commentator, he is still to be found in every age. And even those who are most disposed to break with the past and make a new beginning, are none the less indebted to the despised masters of an earlier generation. Here, as in other branches of literature, there is a deep underlying unity and continuity, however marred and obscured by the manifold differences of warring schools and sects, or by the varying fashions of each age and nation. Even in other fields of sacred science, the first Christian Fathers necessarily retained some traces of their earlier Pagan or Jewish culture. And in like manner the leaders of the Reformation could not rid themselves of the results of their previous Catholic training. And the most advanced and sceptical

modern philosophers are, however unconsciously, indebted for much to the mediæval schoolmen. But, it is scarcely necessary to add, in the case of exegesis the continued presence of a common text is a further and more effective bond of union. For however widely sundered by age and divided by doctrinal difference, all the faithful expounders who succeed in bringing out the true meaning of the text before them must need be in agreement.

But along with this unity which brings all commentators together in one, we may clearly discern an ordered movement and process of change not less unceasing in its operation. Or, in mathematical language, the constant factors in the problem are not more conspicuous than the variable. But these in their turn are not arbitrary, but are subject to laws of their own. And while the curious historian may be content to record the facts, the philosophic student will naturally wish to penetrate beyond them to the fundamental causes. Broadly speaking the long history of exegesis does but furnish a fresh instance of that pregnant principle of Proclus which gave the old schoolmen the key to the problems of ideology. The mind of each man must needs grasp the truth in its own way. The objective message must, so to say, take the mould and color of the subjective recipient. And what is true of the varieties of individual character, applies with equal force to the peculiar powers or limits of each succeeding intellectual generation. Each age must needs understand, and therefore expound, the Bible in its own manner. This, we take it, is the main factor in the historical evolution of exegesis.

This may be best seen when we compare the Scripture commentaries of any period with other branches of contemporary thought and literature. It is a far cry from the allegorical interpretations and dogmatic orthodoxy of the Nicene Fathers to the scientific methods and rigid accuracy of modern critics. Yet in both cases we may plainly see the working of the time-spirit. Both the one and the other do but bring to the interpretation of Scripture the fashions of thought which prevail in their own time and country. Allegorical interpretation was no monopoly of the Fathers; and Higher Criticism is not confined to the pages of Scripture. We turn from Athanasius and his master, Origen, to the pages of Alexandrian Jews and Pagans, only to find unmis-

takable tokens of the same prevailing tendency. The Mosaic law and the myths of Greek poetry are both interpreted by the allegorical method. In the same way we may find Wolf and Niebuhr, and many others of their kind, analyzing Greek epics and Roman history by means of the same critical solvent that Kuenen and Wellhausen have applied to the pages of the Bible. Not that the ages are sharply divided from one another, or show no common characteristics, or that any one system is ever allowed to hold undisputed sway. Mysticism and allegory still hold their own, even in these days of scientific methods and destructive criticism. And in an earlier age, when other ideas predominated, we may yet meet with occasional anticipations of more modern methods.

VI.—Jewish and Christian Schools of Exegesis.

What has been said so far may be illustrated and confirmed by a comparison of the Jewish and Christian schools of exegesis. The very existence of these two independent traditions may be taken as a fresh proof of the natural necessity of Biblical commentaries. And we may see the working of the same laws in the gradual growth of both systems, and in the constant recurrence of similar methods of interpretation. This again affords a notable instance of the underlying unity and continuity which can survive broad doctrinal differences and apparently vital changes. Here, as with our own commentators of different periods, there is a bond of union in the text of the Old Testament. And this in itself must serve to secure some measure of agreement, even in the absence of any other means of communication between the exegetical schools of the Christian Church and the Jewish Synagogue. But it would surely be a mistake to imagine that this common text is in fact the only link that connects the two systems. We have already observed that the sectaries who fondly fancy that they have broken free from the trammels of tradition and made a fresh start with the Bible only, must needs bear with them some remnants of the old tradition. And we may venture to say the same of the first Christian commentators in the age of the Apostles. Even in the absence of any direct evidence on the subject, we might safely assume the existence of some such link between the

two traditions. For the Hebrew Scriptures did not pass without comment into the hands of Gentile converts to Christianity. The Apostles themselves and the vast majority of the first disciples were all Jews, accustomed to hear the sacred text read and expounded in the Temple or the synagogues. Even those who were drawn from the ranks of peasants and fishermen must, in this way, have brought with them some knowledge of the Targums and the traditional Rabbinical exegesis. But we know that some of the disciples were no mean masters in this sacred science. For St. Luke tells us that a great multitude of the Jewish priests were among the early converts to the faith, and the Apostle of the Gentiles had sat at the feet of Gamaliel.[2] And though they brought to the text of the Old Testament a new and a higher light than any that shone from the schools of Shammai or Hillel, it would be strange indeed if their teaching and exposition did not betray some traces of their earlier training.

Much of this primitive Christian exegesis was only delivered by word of mouth, like the first Chaldaic Targums. It has consequently perished, save for the lasting fruits left in the minds of the hearers. And possibly some remnants reappear in the comments of the earlier Fathers. But happily we are not wholly left to conjecture and anticipation in this matter. For as some few of the Apostles' sermons survive to give us a sample of their preaching, so the pages of the New Testament contain a considerable amount of Biblical exegesis, notably in the Gospel of St. Matthew, the Acts, and the Pauline Epistles. Passages from the Prophets and other books of the Old Testament are cited in argument, or applied in practice, and the reader is thus enabled to get a better grasp of their meaning. This matter is surely well worthy of special study; for here we may see the true source and pattern of later patristic and scholastic exegesis, and the connecting link between the two traditions. If we take any one of the main methods of exposition now in use, the literal, the allegorical, the moral or the mystical, the doctrinal or the practical, we can hardly fail to find it fairly represented in these incidental instances of Apostolic exegesis. And alike in the simple citations of St. Matthew and in the labored reasoning of St. Paul, there is much

[2] Acts 6 : 7 ; 22 : 3.

that may well remind us of the methods of the Rabbinical commentators.

VII.—Later Relations of the Two Traditions.

While it can be shown that the founders of Christian exegesis were thus in direct contact with the old Jewish schools, even as the first offices of Christian worship were associated with the service of the Temple, it is clear that the union only held good during that temporary period of transition. In the days of strife and prejudice and persecution that too speedily followed, all such peaceful relations were rudely broken off; and the two traditions had to work out their later development independently. In the succeeding centuries it was but rarely that the Catholic scholar deigned to seek for help in Rabbinical sources. The most conspicuous instance is that of St. Jerome, to whom we all of us owe so much in this matter. But though all later Fathers and schoolmen were glad to avail themselves of the results of his labor, very few were found to follow his example. And though the vast and voluminous exegetical literature of Jews and Christians certainly present many striking analogies in their later development, there are but few points in which it can be safely said that the one has been directly influenced by the other. If we are not mistaken, the agreement is generally due to the simple fact that both have rightly grasped the meaning of the text before them, or that both alike are swayed by the spirit of their age and country. Thus both Jews and Christians, to say nothing of Pagans, were largely affected by Alexandrian allegory; and there is clearly a close kinship between the mediæval Rabbis and schoolmen.

At the same time, as might be expected, the two literatures are separated by plainly marked characteristics. Not to speak of the fundamental differences in doctrinal belief, there is naturally enough a larger measure of life and liberty in the Church of all nations; while the Biblical literature of the chosen people is distinguished by a closer unity and a more rigid conservatism. The tendency to literary syncretism and organization, which prevailed in the Middle Ages and produced such monuments as the Book of Sentences and the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, seems to have left a

deeper and more lasting impress on Jewish literature. For, as we have seen on a former occasion, the chief masterpieces of Hebrew exegesis have been welded together into compact and organized bodies, such as the Talmuds, the Rabbinical Bibles, the *Midrash Rabba*, and, we may add, the *Jalkut*.[3]

This is fortunate for the present purpose of comparison. For while the Catholic student may be supposed to have some familiarity with our own more widely distributed exegetical literature, the less generally known Jewish commentators are, at any rate, more readily accessible.

VIII.—Translations and Exegesis.

Of all the various forms of Biblical interpretation with which we are familiar in our own commentaries, there are few that do not find a counterpart in the pages of the Rabbinical Bible. The harmless, necessary explanation of hard words, historical and local allusions, and deep matters of doctrine; allegory and mysticism, and plain practical lessons; the interpretation which brings out the meaning of the text, and that which reads a meaning into it—nothing comes amiss to the Rabbinical commentator. A good part of all this varied exegesis is contained in the Targums, which do but profess to translate or paraphrase the Hebrew text in the vernacular language of the returning exiles. For, as it has been truly said, translation is one of the best ways of expounding the Scriptures. It is true that a distinction may be made between the office of the translator and that of the commentator. But the dividing line is often apt to be imperceptible. There are some passages in which it is impossible to render the words from one language into another without adopting a particular view as to the meaning of the original, and fixing a question which might else remain open. And, on the other hand, the true expounder who adds nothing to the message conveyed in his text, does but set forth its meaning in other words. And what else is this but translation? This reflection affords a further proof of the folly of those who fancy that they go by the Bible alone, without betaking them-

[3] See Rabbinical Studies, Ecclesiastical Review, March, June, and August, 1902.

selves to the original. For it must sometimes happen that the version, however accurate, puts a gloss on the words of the author. The reader will readily remember more than one passage which thus takes a special color and character from the terms chosen by the translator. Thus, there are three words of frequent occurrence in the English Bible which have a special technical or theological sense—"Spirit," "Priest," and "Angel." And the translator who uses them is thus expounding the passage which, so far as the original goes, may possibly bear a different meaning, to wit, the common natural notions of "wind," or "elder," or "messenger." Thus, in Psalm 103: 4, the Vulgate has "Qui facis angelos tuos spiritus"; and our English version, "Who makest Thy angels spirits." This tallies with the interpretation of the text in Hebrews 1: 7, which is followed by the Fathers—*e. g.*, St. Gregory the Great—and agrees with the liturgical use of the Psalm. But the Hebrew words may be rendered literally, "Who maketh the winds his messengers." And this is how they are understood by the Rabbinical commentators—*e. g.*, Rashi; while the Targum paraphrases the passage, "Who made his messengers swift as the wind."

In another instance, the Latin translator of Acts 20: 17 has taken an opposite course in translating πρεσβυτέρους by *majores natu;* though it would seem that the word has reference not to age, but to office. As Father Battifol observes, it is not likely that the more aged members of the Ephesian Church would have been chosen for this hurried journey to Miletus.

The expository value of the free version contained in the Targum is seen in the case of obscure or ambiguous words in the Hebrew original. We may take as an instance the well-known passage in the prophecy of Jacob concerning Judah (Genesis 49: 10), where the Authorized version, following the Hebrew text, has "Till Shiloh come." This mysterious title has given rise to many and very various interpretations. The Vulgate, as we need hardly remind the reader, has "donec veniet qui mittendus est," which seems to postulate another reading of the original. And some modern critics have attempted to cut the knot by giving a new construction to the sentence, viz., "Till he (sc. Judah) come to Shiloh." This reading, which obviously destroys the Messianic

character of the prophecy, is directly contradicted by the Targumist, who renders Shiloh by "Messiah."

IX.—Messianic Texts—Dogma and Mysticism.

In a passage from his commentary on Isaias, which we read in the Breviary, St. Jerome mentions the Jewish exposition of the prophecy in the eleventh chapter, "Virgam et florem de radice Jesse, ipsum Dominum Judæi interpretantur." It is interesting to note that his report is confirmed by the evidence of the Rabbinical Bible. For the Targum renders the first word by "King," and the second by "Messiah."

In both the above instances, and the same may be said of other Messianic texts, the Jewish tradition agrees with the Christian, in regard to the main purport of the prophecy. Elsewhere, as might be anticipated, we meet with grave differences. Thus, one Psalm, which we know on the highest authority to have a Messianic meaning, the *Dixit Dominus*, is understood by the Rabbinical writers as referring to Abraham, an interpretation which is probably due to the mention of Melchisedech.[4]

In some other instances of divergence, the original import of the text may be open to question. For when once our devout commentators have set themselves to seek for types and anticipations in the Old Testament, everything is apt to be unconsciously colored by the reader's imagination. And sometimes the Messianic exposition of a text is at best an applied meaning. In other cases the prophetic sense of the passage can only be clearly seen by those who already know its fulfilment; and we can hardly wonder at the failure of the old Jewish commentators who had not this advantage.

It is curious to observe that some of the Popes and early Fathers have drawn doctrinal conclusions from texts where the Messianic meaning would seem to be of this secondary or doubtful character. Thus, "Behold, Adam is become as one of us,"[5] is used by Pope John II to show that Christ is one of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. And the remarkable words in Deuteronomy 28: 66: "And thy life shall be as it were hanging before

[4] See the Rabbinical Bible and Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin f. 108.

[5] Genesis 3: 22.

thee. Thou shalt fear night and day, neither shalt thou trust thy life," are applied by the same Pope to the Crucifixion, and cited to prove that God has suffered in the flesh.[6] This last text is used in the same way by St. Leo in a passage read in the Office of the Exaltation of the Cross; but the allusion is possibly missed by many readers.

Another case in which the commentators have discovered a deep meaning in an apparently simple text is John 1: 3–4. In most modern translations, the third verse ends with the words, "without him was made nothing that was made." Yet some of the Fathers, notably St. Augustine and our own St. Bede, connect the last three words with the following verse; and expound the sentence, "Quod factum est in ipso vita erat," as meaning that all things have life in the Divine Word.

This may be matched by more than one passage in the Targums, in which the deep philosophical doctrine of the later Sapiential books is read into the pages of the Pentateuch. Thus the Jerusalem Targum interprets the first words of the Bible: "In the beginning," as "In wisdom." This naturally reminds us of the words of Our Lord, *Principium, qui et loquor vobis.*"[7] Elsewhere in the Targums we read of the "Word of the Lord," where the Hebrew text speaks of the "Angel of the Lord." And there are likewise many allusions to the *Shechinah* or Divine Presence. Taken together these may be regarded as faint foreshadowings of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity.

X.—Limits of the Resemblance: Alleged Jewish Corruptions.—Conclusion.

While these various points of analogy between the Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions form an interesting and instructive study, they must not lead us to overlook or forget the necessary limits of this resemblance, or the deeper differences by which the two literatures are divided. In some cases it may be safely said that the truth of the two interpretations is confirmed by their agreement. In others the resemblance is only partial and possibly fortuitous. It would indeed be idle to look for anything like a

[6] *Epistola ad Senatores Constantinop.*

[7] John 8: 25.

close and complete harmony, while Jews and Christians continue in their present separation. But in spite of the inevitable differences, there is a much greater agreement than might be supposed if we were to judge by the language of some controversialists and theologians. Thus, it has been suggested by some that the Jews have tampered with the text of some of the prophecies, in order to invalidate the arguments adducible from them in support of Christianity. This accusation is as old as the second century. For St. Justin brings it forward in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew. One of his chief instances is the alleged mutilation of Psalm 95[8] by the omission of the words "from the tree" from the tenth verse, "Say ye among the Gentiles, The Lord hath reigned." But the charge can scarcely be substantiated. For the general absence of these words from the Greek MSS., to say nothing of other reasons, seems to show that they were no part of the original, but merely the gloss of some ancient commentator. The addition still survives in the Coptic Psalter. And it has left an echo in one of the finest hymns in the Latin Liturgy:

Impleta sunt quae concinit
David fideli carmine,
Dicendo nationibus,
Regnavit a ligno Deus.

No doubt there are many passages in which the present Hebrew text is imperfect or corrupted. For with the long lapse of years and the inevitable slips of countless copyists, it could not well be otherwise. And our own most orthodox and venerable versions are by no means free from similar imperfections. But the charge of bad faith and wilful perversion probably owes its origin to the proverbial prejudices of theological controversy. It will not be lightly credited by the candid and impartial student of Jewish and Christian Biblical exegesis.

W. H. KENT, O.S.C.

Bayswater, London, England.

[8] Hebrew 96.

IN FATHER MARTIN'S LIBRARY.

WE were at tea when the maid came in and handed a note to Father Martin. He glanced hurriedly through it, called for his card-case, and pencilled a few words upon a blank which he handed back to the servant.

"Do you know a Dr. Wilson, from Cornwall?" he said, thoughtfully.

"There is a Dr. Wilson," I answered, "who visits the Hayden family, where I have met him once or twice. He does not seem to be a Catholic, although I fancy there exists a mutual attraction between him and Miss Tessie, which might influence his views on the subject of religion."

"I see; but he probably also visits Dr. Hayden for professional reasons, if I may judge from the tone of this note which announces his intention to call here this evening."

We went as usual after supper into the library, and as the manuscript volume of Herbert's *Church Porch* was still lying open on the table where Father Martin had laid it down at noon, I took it up. A passage scored in the margin by the words "Aim and manners" caught my glance, and I answered Father Martin's suggestion to discuss the poem until our expected visitor might come, by reading aloud the lines before me.

> Pitch thy behaviour low, thy projects high;
> So shalt thou humble and magnanimous be.
> Sink not in spirit; who aimeth at the sky
> Shoots higher much than he that means a tree.
> A grain of glorie mixt with humblenesse
> Cures both a fever and lethargicknesse.
>
> Let thy minde still be bent, still plotting where,
> And when, and how the businesse may be done.
> Slacknesse breeds worms; but the sure traveller,
> Though he alight sometimes, still goeth on.
> Active and stirring spirits live alone:
> Write on the others: "Here lies such a one."
>
> Slight not the smallest losse, whether it be
> In love or honour; take account of all.

Shine like the sunne in every corner; see
Whether thy stock of credit swell or fall.
Who say "I care not" those I give for lost;
And to instruct them, 'twill not quit the cost.

Scorn no man's love, though of a mean degree,
(Love is a present for a mighty king),
Much lesse make anyone thine ennemie.
As gunnes destroy, so may a little sling.
The cunning workman never doth refuse
The meanest tool, that he may chance to use.

It must be explained here that throughout the MS. copy from which I was reading there were notes and occasional references to an appendix, which served either as a key to the interpretation of the poet's thought, or illustrated his meaning by some parallel passage drawn from Sacred Scripture, or from the old classical writers. Father Martin himself seemed to have these references off quite by memory, for he would at times interrupt the reading by mentioning what some other writer had said in the same vein as our author. Thus I gradually learnt to understand what had hitherto been something of an enigma to me, namely, a certain fondness of his for a set of handwritten folios close to the desk at which he used to sit. I had often seen him when by himself turning over the leaves of these manuscript tomes, which bore no title on the cover, and I had assumed that they were records of a more or less personal character, which prevented my showing any curiosity as to the nature of their contents. But now I came to understand that these volumes represented a sort of chrestomathy, a selection of passages and notes containing gems of good and useful reading with which he stored his mind and colored his whole intellectual expression. It was this habit that enabled him to impart an element of instruction and a natural charm to his most ordinary conversation. The fact dawned upon me for the first time that my pastor had utilized his earlier years by reading *nunquam sine stylo*, as the stoic preceptors wished it. In this way he had garnered the fruits of his most ordinary observations into a private storehouse, making it easy for him at any time to recall what had impressed him as most beautiful in the literary treasure-troves of

the past. He had not only enjoyed the evanescent odor of the flowers, but had sucked into his very being, and converted to practical use, the sweets that were gathered in their chalices; and they had contributed to his moral and intellectual growth and aided him in adapting to his own life the active principles which had rendered the lives of others beautiful and fruitful. What he had read with deliberation and found good became his own by repetition and habitual reflection. Hence he might say with our author that he profited of all wisdom, whether abroad or at home, which by careful selection he appropriated, and freely gave to others.

> All forrain wisdome doth amount to this,
> To take all that is given; whether wealth
> Or love or language; nothing comes amisse:
> A good digestion turneth all to health:
> And then as farre as fair behaviour may,
> Strike off all scores; none are so cleare as they.
>
> Keep all thy native good, and naturalize
> All forrain of that name; but scorn their ill.
> Embrace their activenesse, not vanities.
> Who follows all things forfeiteth his will.
> If thou observest strangers in each fit,
> In time they'l runne thee out of all thy wit.

"Turn over to the good things Herbert says on economical living. That is the sort of wisdom which it behooves a young cleric, I trow, occasionally to remember," he added good-humoredly, as I looked up to find the meaning of the interruption. There was point in the observation, for it was true that in my eagerness to gather a library of my own, I had been captivated by the easy offers of sundry book agencies, and found my salary habitually short, partly owing to the obligations contracted for a large encyclopedia and two or three works on art purchased on the instalment plan. These, Father Martin said on my showing them to him, would never be of any real use to me. I had asked his advice after having signed the agent's subscription blank.

Never exceed thy income. Youth may make
Ev'n with the yeare ; but age, if it will hit,
Shoots a bow short, and lessens still his stake,
As the day lessens, and his life with it.
Thy children, kindred, friends upon thee call ;
Before thy journey fairly part with all.

Yet in thy thriving still misdoubt some evil,
Lest gaining gain on thee, and make thee dimme
To all things els. Wealth is the conjurer's devil,
Whom when he thinks he hath, the devil hath him.
Gold thou mayst safely touch ; but if it stick
Unto thy hands, it woundeth to the quick.

By no means runne in debt ; take thine own measure.
Who cannot live on twenty pounds a yeare,
Cannot on fourtie ; he's a man of pleasure,
A kinde of thing that's for itself too deere.
The curious unthrift makes his cloth too wide,
And spares himself, but would his taylor chide.

Spend not on hopes. They that by pleading clothes
Do fortunes seek when worth and service fail,
Would have their tale beleevéd for their oathes,
And are like empty vessels under sail.
Old courtiers know this. Therefore set out so,
As all the day thou mayst hold out to go.

Be thriftie, but not covetous ; therefore give
Thy need, thine honour, and thy friend his due.
Never was scraper brave man. Get to live ;
Then live, and use it : else it is not true
That thou hast gotten. Surely use alone
Makes money not a contemptible stone.

In similar vein is what the poet says of dressing and personal apparel.

Affect in things about thee cleanlinesse,
That all may gladly board thee, as a flowre.
Slovens take up their stock of noisomenesse
Beforehand, and anticipate their last houre.
Let thy mindes sweetness have his operation
Upon thy body, clothes, and habitation.

In clothes, cheap handsomenesse doth bear the bell,
Wisdome's a trimmer thing, than shop e'er gave.
Say not then: This with that lace will do well;
But: this with my discretion will be brave.

It should be observed that Father Martin did not group the verses in his copy as the author had originally done. He preferred to arrange them in his own way and so as to illustrate one particular thought. The topic, as already mentioned, was noted in the margin, and thus furnished him ready matter for quotation. Nearly all his copied treasures, which I saw later, were thus arranged and must, therefore, have been the result of separate analysis after he had done the reading. He told me that he had copied much at first-hand which was afterwards, during the winter evenings, whilst in a small country mission, digested by him. Then he wrote out what pleased him in the manner of a concordance, so that he might utilize it at any time in his own fashion. He had no thought that his labor might be profitable to others, apart from the fact that it enriched his own mind and powers of expression. Indeed, he believed that any one who had the opportunity of much reading should do for himself such work of noting and analyzing, since it appeared to him the most practicable method by which to acquire the possession of the common treasures of knowledge.

"We priests who continually preach the same truths to the same hearers, have need of varying the form and expression of our instructions, and nothing serves better to this end than the originality and imagery suggested by different writers, especially the poets. We need not quote poetry from the pulpit, and ordinarily it is not even good taste to do so, because it betrays a labored preparation. But the poet's thought and expression, when stored in the mind, prompts a certain readiness and aptness of speech which is pleasing to the average hearer, even if he be not educated.—Can you find a passage which, I think, is marked in the margin, *At Church?*"

I readily found the lines:

When once thy foot enters the church, be bare.
God is more there than thou; for thou art there

Onely by his permission. Then beware,
And make thyself all reverence and fear.
Kneeling ne'er spoil'd silk stocking: quit thy state;
All equal are within the churches gate.

In time of service seal up both thine eies,
And send them to thine heart; that, spying sinne,
They may weep out the stains by them did rise.
Those doors being shut, all by the eare comes in.
—Who marks in church-time others symmetrie
Makes all their beauty his deformitie.

Let vain or busie thoughts have there no part.
Bring not thy plough, thy plots, thy pleasures thither.
Christ purged His temple, so must thou thy heart.
All worldly thoughts are but theeves met together
To couzin[1] thee. Look to thy actions well,
For churches either are our heaven or hell.

What better sermon exhorting Mrs. Bas-Bleu not to criticize your well-meant pulpit efforts, could be found than the lines which follow next:

Judge not the preacher, for he is thy judge.
If thou mislike him, thou conceiv'st him not.
God calleth preaching folly. Do not grudge
To pick out treasures from an earthen pot.
The worst speak sometimes good; if all want sense,
God takes a text, and preacheth patience.

He that gets patience, and the blessing which
Preachers conclude with, has not lost his pains.
He that by being at church escapes the ditch,
Which he might fall in by companions, gains.
He that loves God's abode, and to combine
With saints on earth, shall one day with them shine.

Jest not at the preacher's language or expression;
How knowest thou, but thy sinnes made him misscarrie?
Then turn thy faults and his into confession:
God sent him, whatso'er he be, o tarry,
And love him for his Master; his condition,
Though it be ill, makes him no ill physician.

[1] Deceive.

"Well, I think we have taken the meat out of that poem. But do read the concluding stanzas; they are like the last flowers in the spiritual bouquet, as the French masters of meditation say."

I read the last verses, scored *Admonition to self-examination.*

Summe up at night, what thou hast done by day,
And in the morning, what thou hast to do.
Dresse and undresse thy soul: mark the decay
And growth of it. If with thy watch that too
Be down then, winde up both, since we shall be
Most surely judg'd, make thy accounts agree.

In brief, acquit thee bravely; play the man,
Look not on pleasures as they come, but go.
Defer not the least vertue. Life's poore span
Make not an ell, by trifling in thy wo.
If thou do ill; the joy fades, not the pains;
If well; the pain doth fade, the joy remains.

"Tell me, Father Martin," I said, after I had returned the book to its place on the shelf, "how you came to get the habit of making these records. Is there any system by which one might acquire the same with a moderate hope of good results at my age? for you began, no doubt, to adopt this method of utilizing your time and readings in the seminary, during your student career."

"I don't know that it requires any particular method apart from the desire to keep hold of a good thought when you meet it. And as for your age,—why, you are barely beginning life, and there is nothing in the world to hinder you, in your present circumstances, from beginning a scrap-book of this kind." Here he took down from the shelf Sydney Smith's *Common Place Book*, to illustrate. "That is one way. Another is to have a topical note-book, alphabetically arranged, in which you write down thoughts, facts, or sources of information which occur to you in reading and which might prove useful in your work later on. Of course it is quite possible that the sketching out a definite plan might be helpful; but that should consist rather in observing a few rules as to the character of the reading one should adhere to, and by finding a way to make different topics bear upon one point of illustration. But then—"

The servant came to announce Dr. Wilson, and our conversation on the interesting subject of useful methods of reading and study had to be broken off. As the stranger was ushered into the room, Father Martin welcomed him with that frank spirit of hospitality which seemed inborn in him. Presuming that the visitor had business of a private nature to discuss, I made mien to leave the room after having exchanged the ordinary salutations usual between men who had casually met before. But the Doctor, perceiving my intention, prevented it by intimating that he merely called to obtain advice in a case where his ignorance of what he termed the legislation of the Catholic Church obliged him, in the interest of his patient, to consult those who were best informed in such matters. He himself was not a Catholic, but the etiquette of the medical profession made it, he said, a rule to respect the claims of conscience in all cases in which serious or lasting consequences were to be apprehended as the result of drastic treatment or surgical operation. He had taken the opinion of his friend and senior colleague, Dr. Hayden, with whom he had become intimate a year ago on occasion of a Biological Congress in Belgium where the latter happened to sojourn with his family during the summer, and Dr. Hayden had suggested his calling on some Catholic clergyman, who would direct him in the matter of which he proposed to speak.

ARTHUR WALDON.

(To be continued.)

AN ENGLISH PHYSICIAN PRIEST AT THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION.

CONSIDERING the usually accepted notions as to the sad state of affairs in the Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century, it is a very curiously interesting fact in the history of the eve of the Reformation in England that the greatest scholar of his time, the most prominent physician in the kingdom, and the wise founder of the Royal College of Physicians, gave up his honors, positions and emoluments towards the end of his life to become a clergyman of the Old Church. Few men have been more highly thought of by their contemporaries; none has ever

been more sincerely respected by intimate friends, who were themselves the leaders of the thought of their generation, than Thomas Linacre, physician and clergyman; and his action must stand as the highest possible tribute to the Church in England at that time.

How unimpaired his practical judgment of men and affairs was at the time that he made his change from royal physician to simple priest, can best be gathered from the sagacity displayed in the foundation of the Royal College of Physicians, an institution he was endowing with the wealth he had accumulated in some twenty years of most lucrative medical practice. The Royal College of Physicians represents the first attempt to secure the regulation of the practice of medicine in England, and, thanks to its founder's wonderful foresight and practical wisdom, it remains down to our own day under its original constitution as one of the most effective and highly honored of British scientific foundations. No distinction is more sought at the present time by young British medical men, or by American or even Continental graduates in medicine, than the privilege of adding to their names the letters F.R.C.P. (Eng.), Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of England. The College worked the reformation of medical practice in England, and its methods have proved the suggestive formulæ for many another such institution and for laws that all over the world protect, to some extent at least, the public from quacks and charlatans.

Linacre's change of profession at the end of his life has been a fruitful source of conjecture and misconception on the part of his biographers. Few of them seem to be able to appreciate the fact, common enough in the history of the Church, that a man may, even when well on in years, give up everything to which his life has been so far directed, and from a sense of duty give himself entirely to the attainment of "the one thing necessary." Linacre appears only to have done what many another in the history of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries did without any comment; but his English biographers insist on seeing ulterior motives in it, or else fail entirely to understand it. The same action is not so rare even in our own day that it should be the source of misconception by later writers.

Dr. S. Weir Mitchell has, in the early part of *Dr. North and*

His Friends, a very curious passage with regard to Linacre. One of his characters, St. Clair, says: "I saw, the other day, at Owen's a life of one Linacre, a doctor, who had the luck to live about 1460 to 1524, when men knew little and thought they knew all. In his old age he took for novelty to reading St. Matthew. The fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters were enough. He threw the book aside and cried out, 'Either this is not the Gospel, or we are not Christians.' What else could he say?" St. Clair uses the story to enforce an idea of his own which he states as a question as follows: "And have none of you the courage to wrestle with the thought I gave you, that Christ could not have expected the mass of men to live the life He pointed out as desirable for the first disciples of His faith?"

Dr. Mitchell's anecdote is not accepted by Linacre's biographers generally, though it is copied by Dr. Payne, the writer of the article on Linacre in the (English) *Dictionary of National Biography*, who, however, discredits it somewhat. The story is founded on one Sir John Cheke's account of the conversion of Linacre. It is very doubtful, however, whether Linacre's deprecations of the actions of Christians had reference to anything more than the practice of false swearing so forcibly denounced in the Scriptures, yet which had apparently become frequent at this time. This is Selden's version of the story as quoted by Dr. Johnson, Linacre's most authoritative biographer. Sir John Cheke in his account seems to hint that this chance reading of the Scriptures was the first time Linacre had ever taken the time to read the New Testament.

As Linacre's early education had been obtained, however, at the school of the monastery of Christ Church at Canterbury, and as the monastery schools all used the New Testament as a text-book, and as the offices of the day at which the students were required to attend contained these very passages from Matthew which Linacre is supposed to have read for the first time later in life, this idea is preposterous. Besides, Linacre, as one of the great scholars of his time, intimate friend of Sir Thomas More, of Dean Colet and Erasmus, can scarcely be thought to find his first copy of the Bible only when advanced in years. This is evidently a post-Reformation addition, part of the Protest-

ant tradition with regard to the supposed suppression of the Scriptures in pre-Reformation days, which every one acknowledges now to be absolutely without foundation.

Linacre, as many another before and since, seems only to have realized the true significance of the striking passages in Matthew after life's experiences and disappointments had made him take more seriously the clauses of the Sermon on the Mount. There is much in fifth, sixth, and seventh Matthew that might disturb the complacent equanimity of a man whose main objects in life, though pursued with all honorable unselfishness, had been the personal satisfaction of wide scholarship and success in his chosen profession.

With regard to Sir John Cheke's story, Dr. John Noble Johnson, who wrote the life of Thomas Linacre,[1] which is accepted as the authoritative biography by all subsequent writers, says: "The whole statement carries with it an air of invention, if not on the part of Cheke himself, at least on that of the individual from whom he derives it, and it is refuted by Linacre's known habits of moderation and the many ecclesiastical friendships which, with a single exception, were preserved without interruption until his death. It was a most frequent mode of silencing opposition to the received and established tenets of the Church, when arguments were wanting, to brand the impugner with the opprobrious titles of heretic and infidel, the common resourse of the enemies to innovation in every age and country."

The interesting result of the reflections inspired in Linacre by the reading of Matthew was, as has been said, the resignation of his high office of Royal Physician and the surrender of his wealth for the foundation of chairs in Medicine and Greek at Oxford and Cambridge. With the true liberal spirit of a man who wished to accomplish as much good as possible, his foundations were not limited to his own University of Oxford. After these educational foundations, however, his wealth was applied to the endowment

[1] *The Life of Thomas Linacre*, Doctor in Medicine, Physician to King Henry VIII, the Tutor and Friend of Sir Thomas More and the Founder of the College of Physicians in London. By John Noble Johnson, M.D., late Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, London. Edited by Robert Graves, of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. London: Edward Lumley, Chancery Lane. 1835.

of the Royal College of Physicians and its library, and to the provision of such accessories as might be expected to make the College a permanently useful institution, though left at the same time perfectly capable of that evolution which would suit it to subsequent times and the development of the science and practice of medicine.

Linacre's Education.

Thomas Linacre was born about 1460—the year is uncertain—at Canterbury. Nothing is known of his parents or their condition, though this very silence in their regard would seem to indicate that they were poor and obscure. His education was obtained at the school of the monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury, then presided over by the famous William Selling, the first of the great students of the new learning in England. Selling's interest seems to have helped Linacre to get to Oxford, where he entered at All Souls' College in 1480. In 1484 he was elected a Fellow of the College and seems to have distinguished himself in Greek, to which he applied himself with special assiduity under Cornelio Vitelli. Though Greek is sometimes spoken of as having been introduced into Western Europe only at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Linacre seems to have laid the foundation for that remarkable knowledge of the language which he displayed at a later period of his life, during his student days at Oxford in the last quarter of the fifteenth century.

Linacre went to Italy under the most auspicious circumstances. His old tutor and friend at Canterbury, Selling, who had become one of the leading ecclesiastics of England, was sent to Rome as an Ambassador by Henry VII. He took Linacre with him. A number of English scholars had recently been in Italy and had attracted attention by their geniality, by their thorough-going devotion to scholarly studies, and by their success in their work. Selling himself had made a nnmber of firm friends among the Italian students of the new learning on a former visit, and they now welcomed him with enthusiasm and were ready to receive his protegé with good will and provide him with the best opportunities for study. As a member of the train of the English ambassador, Linacre had an *entrée* to political circles that proved

of great service to him, and put him on a distinct footing above that of the ordinary English student in Italy.

Partly because of these and partly because of his own interesting and attractive personal character, Linacre had a number of special opportunities promptly placed at his disposal. Church dignitaries at Rome welcomed him and he at once obtained an entry into scholarly circles wherever he went in Italy. Almost as soon as he arrived in Florence, where he expected seriously to take up the study of Latin and Greek, he became the intimate friend of the family of Lorenzo de' Medici who was so charmed with his personality and his readily recognizable talent that he chose him for the companion of his son's studies and received him into his own household.

Politian was at this time the tutor of the young de' Medici in Latin, and Demetrius Chalcondylas the tutor in Greek. Under these two eminent scholars Linacre obtained a knowledge of Latin and Greek such as it would have been impossible to have obtained under any other circumstances, and which with his talents at once stamped him as one of the foremost humanistic scholars in Europe. While in Florence he came in contact with Lorenzo the Magnificent's younger son, who afterwards became Leo X. The friendship thus formed lasted all during Linacre's lifetime, and later on he dedicated at least one of his books to Alexander de' Medici after he became Pope.

It is no wonder that Linacre always looked back on Italy as the Alma Mater—the true mother in the fullest sense of the term—to whom he owed his precious opportunities for education and the broadest possible culture. In after-life the expression of his feelings was often tinged with romantic tenderness. It is said that when he was crossing the Alps, on his homeward journey, leaving Italy after finishing his years of apprenticeship of study, on the highest point of the mountains from which he could still see the Italian plains, he built with his own hands a rough altar of stone and dedicated it to the land of his studies—the land in which he had spent six happy years—under the fond title of *Sancta Mater Studiorum.*

At first after his return from Italy, Linacre lectured on Greek at Oxford. Something of the influence acquired over English

students and the good he accomplished may be appreciated from the fact that with Grocyn he had such students as More and the famous Dean Colet. Erasmus also was attracted from the Netherlands and studied Greek under Linacre, to whom he refers in the most kindly and appreciative terms many times in his after-life. Linacre wrote books besides lecturing, and his work on certain fine points in the grammar of classical Latinity proved a revelation to English students of the old classical languages, for nothing so advanced as this had ever before been attempted outside Italy. In one of the last years of the fifteenth century Linacre became a tutor to Prince Arthur, the elder brother of Henry VIII, to whom it will be remembered that Catherine of Aragon had been betrothed before her marriage with Henry. Arthur's untimely death, however, soon put an end to Linacre's tutorship.

As pointed out by Einstein, the reputation of Grocyn and Linacre was not confined to England, but soon spread all over the Continent. After the death of the great Italian humanists of the fifteenth century, who had no worthy successors in the Italian peninsula, these two men became the principal European representatives of the new learning. There were other distinguished men, however, such as Vives, the Spaniard; Lascaris, the Greek; Buda, or Budæus, the Frenchman, and Erasmus, whom we have already mentioned—all of whom joined at various times in praising Linacre.

Some of Linacre's books were published by the elder Aldus at Venice; and Aldus is even said to have sent his regrets on publishing his edition of Linacre's translation of *The Sphere of Proclus*, that the distinguished English humanist had not forwarded him others of his works to print. Aldus appreciatively added the hope that the eloquence and classic severity of style in Linacre's works and in those of the English humanists generally "might shame the Italian philosophers and scholars out of their uncultured methods of writing."

Theodosia Drane, in *Christian Schools and Scholars*, gives a very pleasant picture of how Dean Colet, Erasmus and More used at this time to spend their afternoons down at Stepney (then a very charming suburb of London), of whose parish church Colet was the Vicar. They stopped at Colet's house and were entertained

by his mother, to whom we find pleasant references in the letters that passed between these scholars. Linacre was also often of the party, and the conversations between these greatest students and literary geniuses of their age would indeed be interesting reading, if we could only have had preserved for us, in some way, the table-talk of those afternoons. Erasmus particularly was noted for his wit and for his ability to turn aside any serious discussions that might arise among his friends, so as to prevent anything like unpleasant argument in their friendly intercourse. A favorite way seems to have been to insist on telling one of the old jokes from a classic author whose origin would naturally be presumed to be much later than the date the new learning had found for it.

Dean Colet's mother seems to have been much more than merely the conventional hostess. Erasmus sketches her in her ninetieth year with her countenance still so fair and cheerful that you would think she had never shed a tear. Her son tells in some of his letters to Erasmus and More of how much his mother liked his visitors and how agreeable she found their talk and witty conversation. They seem to have appreciated her in turn, for in Mother Drane's chapter on English Scholars of the Renaissance there is something of a description of her garden, in which were to be found strawberries, lately brought from Holland, some of the finer varieties of which Mrs. Colet possessed through Erasmus' acquaintance in that country. Mrs. Colet also had some of the damask roses that had lately been introduced into England by Linacre, who was naturally anxious that the mother of his friend should have the opportunity to raise some of the beautiful flowers that he was so much interested in domesticating in England.

It is a very charming picture, this, of the early humanists in England, and very different from what might easily be imagined by those unfamiliar with the details of the life of the period. Linacre was later to give up his worldly emoluments and honors and become a clergyman in order to do good and at the same time satisfy his own craving for self-abnegation. More was to rise to the highest positions in England, and then for conscience' sake was to suffer death rather than yield to the wishes of his king in a matter in which he saw principle involved. Dean Colet himself was to be the ornament of the English clergy and the

model of the scholar clergyman of the eve of the Reformation, to whom many generations were to look back as a worthy object of reverence. Erasmus was to become involved first with and then against Luther, and to be offered a cardinal's hat before his death. His work, like Newman's, was done entirely in the intellectual field. Meantime, in the morning of life, all of them were enjoying the pleasures of friendly intercourse and the charms of domestic felicity under circumstances that showed that their study of humanism and their admiration for the classics impaired none of their sympathetic humanity or their appreciation of the innocent delights of the present.

Linacre as a Physician.

Besides his humanistic studies while in Italy, Linacre graduated in medicine, obtaining the degree of Doctor at Padua. The memory of the brilliant disputation which he sustained in the presence of the medical faculty in order to obtain his degree is still one of the precious traditions in the medical school at Padua. He does not seem to have considered his medical education finished, however, by the mere fact of having obtained his doctor's degree, and there is a tradition of his having studied later at Vicenza under Nicholas Leonicenus, the most celebrated physician and scholar in Italy at the end of the fifteenth century, who many years afterwards referred with pardonable pride to the fact that he had been Linacre's teacher in medicine.

It may seem strange to many that Linacre, with all his knowledge of the classics, should have devoted himself for so many years to the study of medicine in addition to his humanistic studies. It must not be forgotten, however, that the revival of the classics of Latin and Greek brought with it a renewed knowledge of the great Latin and Greek fathers of medicine, Hippocrates and Galen. This had a wonderful effect in inspiring the medical students of the time with renewed enthusiasm for the work in which they were engaged. A knowledge of the classics led to the restoration of the study of anatomy, botany, and of clinical medicine, which had been neglected in the midst of application to the Arabian writers in medicine during the preceding centuries. The restoration of the classics made of medicine a progressive

science in which every student felt the possibility of making great discoveries that would endure not only for his own reputation but for the benefit of humanity.

These thoughts seem to have attracted many promising young men to the study of medicine. The result was a period of writing and active observation in medicine that undoubtedly makes this one of the most important of literary medical eras. Some idea of the activity of the writers of the time can be gathered from the important medical books—most of them large folios—which were printed during the last half of the sixteenth century in Italy. There is a series of these books to be seen in one of the cases of the library of the Surgeon-General at Washington, which, though by no means complete, must be a source of never-ending surprise to those who are apt to think of this period as a *saison morte* in medical literature.

There must have been an extremely great interest in medicine to justify all this printing. Some of the books are among the real incunabula of the art of printing. For instance, in 1474 there was published at Bologna De Manfredi's *Liber de Homine;* at Venice, in 1476, Petrus de Albano's work on medicine; and in the next twenty years from the same home of printing there came large tomes by Angelata, a translation of Celsus, and Aurelius Cornelius and Articellus' *Thesaurus Medicorum Veterum*, besides several translations of Avicenna and Platina's work *De Honesta Voluptate et Valetudine.* At Ferrara, Arculanus' great work was published, while at Modena there appeared the *Hortus Sanitatis*, or Garden of Health, whose author was J. Cuba. There were also translations from other Arabian authors on medicine in addition to Avicenna, notably a translation of Rhazes Abu Bekr Muhammed Ben Zankariah Abrazi, a distinguished writer among the Arabian physicians of the Middle Ages.

Linacre's translations of Galen remain still the standard, and they have been reprinted many times. As Erasmus once wrote to a friend, in sending some of these books of Galen, "I present you with the works of Galen now by the help of Linacre, speaking better Latin than they ever before spoke Greek." Linacre also translated Aristotle into Latin, and Erasmus paid them the high compliment of saying that Linacre's Latin was as lucid, as

straightforward, and as thoroughly intelligible as was Aristotle's Greek." Of the translations of Aristotle unfortunately none are extant. Of Galen we have the *De Sanitate Tuenda*, the *Methodus Medendi*, the *De Symptomatum Differentiis et Causis* and the *De Pulsuum Usu*. The latter particularly is a noteworthy monograph on an important subject, in which Galen's observations were of great value. Under the title, "The Significance of the Pulse," it has been translated into English, and has influenced many generations of English medical men.

While we have very few remains of Linacre's work as a physician, there seems no doubt that he was considered by all those best capable of judging, to stand at the head of his profession in England. To his care, as one of his biographers remarked, was committed the health of the foremost in Church and State. Besides being the Royal Physician, he was the regular medical attendant of Cardinal Wolsey, of Archbishop Warham, the Primate of England, of Richard Fox, Bishop of Winchester, the Keeper of the Privy Seal, and of Sir Reginald Bray, Knight of the Garter and Lord High Treasurer, and of all of the famous scholars of England.

Erasmus, whilst absent in France, writes to give him an account of his feelings, and begs him to prescribe for him, as he knows no one else to whom he can turn with equal confidence. After a voyage across the channel, during which he had been four days at sea—making a passage by the way that now takes less than two hours—Erasmus describes his condition, his headache, with the glands behind his ears swollen, his temples throbbing, a constant buzzing in his ears; and laments that no Linacre is at hand to restore him to health by his skilful advice. In a subsequent letter he writes from Paris to ask for a copy of a prescription given him while in London by Linacre, but which a stupid servant had left at the apothecary shop, so that Erasmus could not have it filled in Paris.

An instance of his skill in prognosis, the most difficult part of the practice of medicine according to Hippocrates and all subsequent authorities, is cited by all his biographers, with regard to his friend William Lily, the grammarian. Lily was suffering from a malignant tumor involving the hip, which surgeons in consultation

had decided should be removed. Linacre plainly foretold that its removal would surely prove fatal, and the event verified his unfavorable prognosis. Generally it seems to have been considered that his opinion was of great value in all serious matters, and it was eagerly sought for. Some of the nobility and clergy of the time came even from the Continent over to England—by no means an easy journey, even for a healthy man in those days—in order to obtain Linacre's opinion.

One of Erasmus' letters to Billibaldus Pirckheimer contains a particular account of the method of treatment by which he was relieved of his severe pain under Linacre's direction in a very tormenting attack of renal colic. The details, especially the use of poultice applications as hot as could be borne, show that Linacre thoroughly understood the use of heat in the relaxation of spasm, while his careful preparation of the remedies to be employed in the presence of the patient himself would seem to show that he had a very high appreciation of how much the mental state of the patient and the attitude of expectancy thus awakened may have in giving relief even in cases of severe pain.

The only medical writings of Linacre's that we possess are translations. We have said already that the reversion at the end of the fifteenth century to the classical authorities in medicine undoubtedly did much to introduce the observant phase of medical science which had its highest expression in Vesalius at the beginning of the sixteenth century and continued to flourish so fruitfully during the next two centuries at most of the Italian universities. His translations then were of themselves more suggestive contributions to medicine than would perhaps have been any even of his original observations, since the mind of his generation was not ready as yet to be influenced by discoveries made by contemporaries.

The Royal College of Physicians.

The best proof of Linacre's great practical interest in medicine is his realization of the need for the Royal College of Physicians and his arrangements for it.

The Roll of the College, which comprises biographical sketches of all the eminent physicians whose names are recorded in the

annals from the foundation of the College in 1518, and is published under the authority of the College itself, contains the best tribute to Linacre's work that can possibly be paid. It says: "The most magnificent of Linacre's labors was the design of the Royal College of Physicians of London—a standing monument of the enlightened views and generosity of its projectors. In the execution of it Linacre stood alone, for the munificence of the Crown was limited to a grant of letters-patent; whilst the expenses and provision of the College were left to be defrayed out of his own means, or of those who were associated with him in its foundation." "In the year 1518," says Dr. Johnson,[2] "when Linacre's scheme was carried into effect, the practice of medicine was scarcely elevated above that of the mechanical arts, nor was the majority of its practitioners among the laity better instructed than the mechanics by whom these arts were exercised. With the diffusion of learning to the republics and states of Italy, establishments solely for the advancement of science had been formed with success; but no society devoted to the interests of learning yet existed in England, unfettered by an union with the hierarchy, or exempted from the rigors and seclusions which were imposed upon its members as the necessary obligation of a monastic and religious life. In reflecting on the advantages which had been derived from these institutions, Linacre did not forget the impossibility of adapting rules and regulations which accorded with the state of society in the Middle Ages to the improved state of learning in his own, and his plans avowedly modelled on some similar community of which many cities of Italy afforded rather striking examples."

Some idea of the state into which the practice of medicine had fallen in England before Linacre's foundation of the Royal College of Physicians may be gathered from the words of the charter of the College. "Before this period a great multitude of ignorant persons, of whom the greater part had no insight into physic, nor into any other kind of learning—some could not even read the letters on the book, so far forth that common artificers as smiths, weavers and women—boldly and accustomably took upon them great cures to the high displeasure of God, great infamy of the faculty,

[2] *Life of Linacre*, London, 1835.

and the grievous hurt, damage and destruction of many of the King's liege people."

After the foundation of the College there was a definite way of deciding formally who were, or were not, legally licensed to practise. As a consequence, when serious malpractice came to public notice, those without a license were occasionally treated in the most summary manner. Stowe, in his chronicles, gives a very vivid and picturesque description of the treatment of one of these quacks who had been especially flagrant in his imposition upon the people. A counterfeit doctor was set on horseback, his face to the horse's tail, the tail being forced into his hand as a bridle, a collar of jordans about his neck, a whetstone on his breast, and so led through the city of London with ringing of basins, and banished. "Such deceivers," continued the old chronicler, "no doubt are many, who being never trained up in reading or practice of physics and Chirurgery do boast to do great cures especially upon women, as to make them straight that before were crooked, corbed, or crumped in any part of their bodies and other such things. But the contrary is true. For some have received gold when they have better deserved the whetstone."[3] Human nature has not changed very much in the four centuries since Linacre's foundation, and while the model that he set in the matter of providing a proper licensing body for physicians has done something to lessen the evils complained of, the abuses still remain and the old chronicler will find in our time not a few who, in his opinion, might deserve the whetstone. We can scarcely realize how much Linacre accomplished by means of the Royal College of Physicians, or how great was the organizing spirit of the man to enable him to recognize the best way out of the chaos of medical practice in his time.

"The wisdom of Linacre's plan," wrote Dr. Friend, "speaks for itself. His scheme without doubt was not only to create a good understanding and unanimity among his own profession (which of itself was an excellent thought), but to make them more useful to the public. And he imagined that by separating

[3] "To get the whetstone" is an old English expression, meaning to take the prize for lying. It is derived from the old custom of driving rogues, whose wits were too sharp, out of town with a whetstone around their necks.

them from the vulgar empirics and setting them upon such a reputable foot of distinction, there would always arise a spirit of emulation among men liberally educated, which would animate them in pursuing their inquiries into the nature of diseases and the methods of cure for the benefit of mankind; and perhaps no founder ever had the good fortune to have his designs succeed more to his wish."

His plans with regard to the teaching of medicine at the two great English universities did not succeed so well, but that was the fault not of Linacre nor of the directions left in his will, but of the times which were awry for educational matters. Notwithstanding Linacre's bequest of funds for two professorships at Oxford and one at Cambridge, it is typical of the times that the chairs were not founded for many years. During Henry VIII's time, the great effort of government was not to encourage new foundations but to break up old ones in order to obtain money for the royal treasury, and educational institutions of all kinds suffered eclipse. The first formal action with regard to the Linacre bequest was taken in the third year of Edward VI. Two lectureships were established in Merton College, Oxford, and one in St. John's College, Cambridge. Linacre's idea had been that these foundations should be University lectureships, but Anthony Wood says that the University had lost in prestige so much during Henry VIII's time that it was considered preferable to attach the lectureships to Merton College, which had considerable reputation because of its medical school. During Elizabeth's time these Linacre lectureships sank to be sinecures and for nearly a hundred years served but for the support of a fellowship. The Oxford foundation was revived in 1856 by the University Commissioners, and the present splendid foundation of the lectures in physiology bear Linacre's name in honor of his original grant.

Linacre as a Clergyman.

At the age of about fifty, Linacre was ordained priest. His idea in becoming a clergyman, as confessed in letters to his friends, was partly in order to obtain leisure for his favorite studies, but also the desire to give himself up to something other than the

mere worldly pursuits in which he had been occupied all during his previous life. His biographer, Dr. Johnson, says: "In examining the motives of this choice of Linacre's it would seem that he was guided less by the exceptation of dignity and preferment, than by the desire of retirement and of rendering himself acquainted with those writings which might afford him consolation in old age and relief from the infirmities which a life of assiduous study and application had tended to produce."

The precise time of Linacre's ordination is not known, nor is it certain whether he was ordained by Archbishop Warham of Canterbury, or by Cardinal Wolsey, the Archbishop of York. He received his first clerical appointment from Warham, by whom he was collated to the rectory of Mersham in Kent. He held this place scarcely a month, but his resignation was followed by his installation as prebend in the Cathedral of Wells, and by an admission to the Church of Hawkhurst in Kent, which he held until the year of his death. Seven years later he was made prebend in the Collegiate Chapel of St. Stephen, Westminster, and in the following year he became prebendary of South Newbold in the Church of York. This was in the year 1518. In the following year he received the dignified and lucrative appointment of presentor to the Cathedral of York, for which he was indebted to Cardinal Wolsey, to whom about this time he dedicated his translation of Galen *On the Use of the Pulse*. He seems also to have held several other benefices during the later years of his life, although some of them were resigned within so short a time as to make it difficult to understand why he should have accepted them, since the expenses of institution must have exceeded the profits which were derived from them during the period of possession.

Linacre owed his clerical opportunities during the last years of his life particularly to Archbishop Warham, who, as ambassador, primate and chancellor, occupied a large and honorable place in the history of the times. Erasmus says of him in one of his letters: "Such were his vigilance and attention in all matters relating to religion and to the offices of the Church, that no concern which was foreign to them, seemed ever to distract him. He had sufficient time for a scrupulous performance of the accustomed exercises of prayer, for the almost daily celebration of the Mass,

for twice or thrice hearing divine service, for determining suits, for receiving embassies, for consultation with the king when subjects of moment required his presence, for the visitation of churches when regulation was needed, for the welcome of frequently two hundred guests, and lastly for a literary leisure."

As the close friend of such men it is evident that Linacre must have accomplished much good as a clergyman, and it seemed not unlikely that his frequent changes of rectorship were rather due to the fact that the Primate wished to make use of his influence in various parts of his diocese for the benefit of religion than for any personal motives on Linacre's part, who had given up so much more than he could expect as a clergyman in order to enter the service of the Church.

Linacre as a clergyman centinued to deserve the good will and esteem of all his former friends, and seems to have made many new ones. At the time of his death, he was one of the most honored individuals in England. All of his biographers are agreed in stating that he was the representative Englishman of his time, looked up to by all his contemporaries, respected and admired by those who had not the opportunity of his intimate acquaintance, and heartily loved by friends, who were themselves some of the best men of the time.

The concluding paragraph of the appreciation of Linacre's character in *Lives of British Physicians*[4] is as follows: "To sum up his character it was said of him that no Englishman of his day had had such famous masters, namely Demetrius and Politian of Florence; such noble patrons, Lorenzo de' Medici, Henry VII and Henry VIII; such high-born scholars, the Prince Arthur and Princess Mary of England; or such learned friends, for amongst the latter were to be enumerated Erasmus, Melanchthon, Latimer, Tonstal, and Sir Thomas More." His biographer might have added the names of others of the pre-Reformation period, men of culture and character whose merits only the historical researches of recent years have brought out,—Prior Selling, Dean Colet, (though this friendship was unfortunately interrupted), Archbishop Warham, Cardinal Wolsey, Grocyn, and further scholars and churchmen.

[4] London: John Murray, 1830.

Dr. J. F. Payne, in summing up the opinion of Linacre held by his contemporaries in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (British), pays a high tribute to the man. "Linacre's personal character was highly esteemed by his contemporaries. He was evidently capable of absolute devotion to a great cause, animated by genuine public spirit and a boundless zeal for learning." Erasmus sketches him humorously in the *Encomium Moriae* (The Praise of Foolishness), with a play on the word *Moriae* in reference to his great friend, Thomas More, of whom Erasmus thought so much, showing him a tireless student. The distinguished foreign scholar, however, considered Linacre as an enthusiast in recondite studies, but no mere pedant. Dr. Payne closes his appreciation with these words: "Linacre had, it would seem, no enemies."

Caius, the distinguished English physician and scholar, himself one of the best known members of the Royal College of Physicians and the founder of Caius' College, Cambridge, sketches Linacre's character (he had as a young man known him personally) in very sympathetic vein. As Dr. Caius was one of the greatest Englishmen of his time in the middle of the sixteenth century, his opinion must carry great weight. It is to him that we owe the famous epitaph that for long in old St. Paul's, London, was to be read on Linacre's tombstone:

"Fraudes dolosque mire perosus, fidus amicis, omnibus ordinibus juxta carus"—

"A stern hater of deceit and underhand ways, faithful to his friends, equally dear to all classes."

Surely this is a worthy tribute to the great physician, clergyman, scholar and philanthropist of the eve of the Reformation in England.

JAS. J. WALSH, M.D., PH.D.

New York City.

A DISPUTED POINT IN ST. CYPRIAN'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PRIMACY.

AN article in the April number of *The Church Quarterly Review*, on "England and Rome in the Middle Ages," must have come as a rude awakening to a great many Anglicans who had been brought up in the belief that the Reformation was "but an episode in the history of the English Church." Instead of this, they are informed by their leading Review, that the Reformation was a "breach" in the continuity of the relations between the two Churches,—a "violent breach with old habits and old rules of conduct," and that it is "futile" to try to maintain the contrary in the present state of our historical knowledge, and yet it cannot be said that our knowledge of the subject has received of late any substantial increase. Professor Maitland merely threw its legal aspect into stronger relief, and *compelled attention to it.* This is the only difference between his able treatise on *Roman Canon Law in England* and much that had already appeared in Catholic publications. The truth is that the Anglican apologists of Continuity, starting with a preconceived idea, bent the facts to suit their theory, however unconsciously. As a recent writer puts it, though in a different connection: "The doubtful passages were all read the one way; even the assured were given a twist, for if the wind persistently keeps in one direction even the oaks will take a set to one side."

It is in this sense that the admission of the *Church Quarterly* is so noteworthy. For if, as it seems likely, recourse will be had to the early centuries of Church history for a more promising *point d'appui* against the Primacy of the Holy See, unprejudiced minds may well ask how it is likely to fare with the Anglican apologist in the dim historic past,[1] when facts of comparatively recent date, and attested by such a wealth of clear evidence, suffered so considerable a refraction on entering the Anglican medium.

[1] It is significant, in this respect, that Dr. Lock, in his preface to the late Canon Bright's otherwise brilliant *The Age of the Fathers*, should have felt constrained to make an apology for "an unduly suspicious and hostile attitude towards the occupants of the Roman See."

Hitherto great stress has always been laid by Anglican writers on what they conceive to have been St. Cyprian's attitude towards the Roman See, and as the stress is not likely to be relaxed now, but rather increased, the present seems an opportune moment for examining more closely an act in the life of the Saint which forms the corner-stone of the Anglican contention,—and as to which there has been and is considerable controversy, even among Catholics.

The question I propose to discuss is whether the synod held at Carthage on the 1st of September, 256, under the presidency of St. Cyprian, in which the invalidity of heretical baptism was strongly reaffirmed, was convened before the counter-decision of Pope Stephen I had reached Carthage, or subsequent to its reception. The question is an important one. If the priority of St. Stephen's decision, or rather of its reception by St. Cyprian, can be established, the latter was guilty of an act of schism, whether followed by excommunication or not. If, on the other hand, the synod came first in order of time, it is, as regards the Holy See, on precisely the same footing as its predecessors, and cannot be brought forward any more than they, as implying a rejection of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome by Cyprian.

The disagreement which existed in Africa on this subject had but recently given rise to two synods,—likewise presided over by Cyprian. The first, held in 255, was but thinly attended, only thirty-one bishops being present,[2] and seems from the Saint's letter to Quintus[3] to have been without much effect. The second was convoked in the spring of the following year,[4] and the increased attendance—seventy-one bishops were present—bears witness to the activity and influence of the Primate. The conclusions of the synod, so far as they related to re-baptism, were forwarded to Pope Stephen,[5] together with the acts of the previous synod, and Cyprian's letter to Quintus.

It is important to note that, so far, there is no evidence that either St. Cyprian or the members of the synod were aware that their views were in conflict with Roman doctrine and practice. Can this be maintained also of the third synod, which met in the

[2] Ep. 70.
[3] Ep. 71, 1.
[4] Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, p. 118 (2d Ed.).
[5] Ep. 72.

autumn of this same year? Or had Stephen's decision: "Let there be no innovation upon what has been handed down,"[6] and the accompanying threat of excommunication[7] been received in the interval that elapsed between the second synod and the holding of the third?

It may be said that in this matter the verdict of Catholic historians has hitherto been generally unfavorable to Cyprian, and he is only excused on the ground that he did not regard the question as one of doctrine but of practice. This explanation, however true, does not acquit him of a grave act of insubordination. But of late years there has been a growing disposition to doubt whether there is insufficient evidence for holding that he went so far as to oppose the Pope in synod even on what he considered to be merely a point of discipline. Indeed it may be said that a reversal of opinion is becoming more and more general, and that the most competent writers now lean strongly to the view that the synod preceded the reception of the decree.[8]

If we except some statements by later writers, the documents bearing upon the question are limited to a few letters of St. Cyprian and the acts of the third synod. Before arguing from these documents, it will be well for the sake of clearness to say a word or two about them and their subject-matter.

They all deal with the question as to the validity of baptism administered by heretics. As early as 205, Agrippinus of Carthage had assembled the Bishops of Numidia and Africa in order to discuss the matter, and St. Cyprian lays great stress on their rejection of such baptisms as invalid.[9] Half a century elapsed before the question seems to have become acute once more. About 255, a dispute arose among some eighteen Numidian bishops and other fellow-bishops, on this subject, and was referred to a synod presided over by St. Cyprian, whose seventieth letter embodies the decisions arrived at. The view of the Numidians is declared to be the correct one, as no one "can be baptized outside the Church."[10]

[6] Ep. 74, 1.

[7] Ep. 74, 8. Hartel's edition is quoted throughout.

[8] *Cf.* Grisar, *Theol. Leit.*, 1881. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie.* Bruck, etc. Hefele leaves the question open. *Ibid.*, p. 119.

[9] Ep. 71 and 73.

[10] Ep. 70, 1.

That disagreement on this subject was not confined to Numidia is shown by the questions addressed to Cyprian by the Mauritanian Bishop Quintus, questions which he replies to in his seventy-first letter. It is clear that the first synod had not been so successful as he desired, and he speaks in strong terms of the opposition and presumption of some of his colleagues.[11] This want of success may account for the summoning of a second synod in the spring of 256,—the greatly increased attendance being due, no doubt, to the energy and zeal displayed in the interval by St. Cyprian, who was fighting in this matter, as he says himself, "for the honor and unity of the Church."[12] At the close of the synod he forwarded to Pope Stephen such of its decisions as concerned re-baptism,[13] together with his own letter to Quintus and the findings of the first synod.

As these were the synodic documents which drew from Stephen his "Nil innovetur nisi quod traditum est," I shall give a couple of quotations illustrative of their standpoint and of the spirit in which they were drawn up. "Many matters were brought forward and discussed. But it was our duty to write to thee most especially and confer with thy gravity and wisdom concerning that which pertains more closely to sacerdotal authority and to the unity and dignity of the Catholic Church which arises out of the arrangement of the divine disposition." Then follows a statement of the views of the synod that "those who have been baptized outside the Church . . . must be baptized when they return to us and to the Church which is one, because it is of little account to impose hands upon them that they may receive the Holy Ghost, unless they receive also the baptism of the Church."[14] This synodic letter concludes as follows: "We have placed the matters before thy conscience, beloved brother, . . . believing that what is both pious and true doth also meet with thy approval on account of the truth of thy piety and faith. For the rest, we know that some people put away with difficulty views they have

[11] Ep. 71, 1. Nescio qua praesumptione ducuntur quidam de collegis nostris ut putent eos qui apud haereticos tincti sunt, quando ad nos venerint, baptizari non oportere . . . quidam de collegis nostris malunt haereticis honorem dare quam nobis consentire," etc.

[12] Ep. 73, 11. [13] Ep. 72. [14] Ep. 72, 1.

once entertained, and do not easily alter their resolutions, but retain some peculiar customs which have once been adopted among themselves, whilst maintaining intact among their colleagues the bond of peace and concord. In this matter neither do we do violence to any one or put forth a law, since each bishop (*praepositus*) enjoys the free choice of his will in the administration of his Church, and must give an account to the Lord."

In the next place we have a letter from Cyprian to Jabainus,[15] a Mauritanian Bishop, who had forwarded to him a controversial document which was being circulated in Africa. Cyprian's reply is concerned chiefly with the refutation of this document which supplies further evidence that opposition to his views was by no means at an end. We quote the concluding words, as they have an important bearing on our subject: "We have written these things to thee in brief, as far as our mediocrity allowed, most dear brother, dictating to no one nor prejudging, lest each of the bishops should do what he thinks, having the free power of his choice. We, as far as it lies with us, do not contend with our colleagues and brother-bishops on account of the heretics, but keep with them the divine concord and peace of the Lord."

Compare with these words the conclusion of a letter to Magnus, written before the first synod and dealing with the same topic. "I have answered thy letter, beloved son, as far as our small mediocrity was able, and have shown thee what we, in so far as it lies with us, think,—dictating to no one lest each bishop (*praepositus*) should decide as he thinks, as having to render an account of his act to the Lord, according to what the Blessed Apostle Paul writes in his letter to the Romans and says: 'Each one of us will render an account of himself. Let us therefore not judge one another.'"[16]

That St. Cyprian should disclaim, once in a way, any wish to force his opinion on his brother-bishops, judge them, or otherwise interfere in the administration of their dioceses, need cause no surprise. But when we find the disclaimer repeated, in almost identical terms, in all the documents from his hand bearing upon this subject, and even sent beyond the seas to Stephen, we cannot regard the repetition as accidental. Now, if it can be shown—as

[15] Ep. 73, 26. [16] Ep. 69, 17.

indeed I think it can—that the reference is to the state of affairs in Africa, and that the disclaimer was called for by the accusations of his opponents, the contention is reasonable that, when we find it repeated once more at the third synod, it should still be understood *in the same sense*, and that we should refuse to read into his words a new meaning, an allusion to Stephen, until some better argument is adduced than their greater or lesser applicability to his action.

The opposition St. Cyprian had to contend against in Africa dated from his episcopal consecration. When this took place, in spite of his resistance, he was still a neophyte, and this circumstance always remained a difficulty, and was frequently urged against him. In his defence he appealed to the *judicium Dei*, to the consensus of his brother-bishops, and the suffrages of his people. In a letter to the latter he complains of the "malignity and perfidy" of certain presbyters, "who repeat their old accusations against my episcopacy—indeed, against your suffrage and the judgment of God."[17] Writing to a certain bishop named Florentius Pappianus, he charges him, in vehement terms, with a wish to pass judgment, "after God the Judge who makes priests, I will not say on me—of what account am I?—but on the judgment of God and of Christ,"[18] and censures him for setting himself up as *episcopum episcopi*,[19] the bishop of a bishop. Later he speaks of "God constituting a bishop," and finally warns Pappianus to think "of the majesty of God, who ordains the priests of Christ."[20]

According to the late Dr. Benson, "the African episcopate had declined in character during the long peace; many bishops were engaged in trade, agriculture, or usury; some were conspicuously fraudulent or immoral, or too ignorant to instruct catechumens or avoid using heretical compositions in public prayers."[21] If this picture is even approximately true—and it would seem that it is—it is easily intelligible how the opposition

[17] Ep. 43, 1. [18] Ep. 66, 1.

[19] *Ibid.*, c. 3. This expression should be noted. It will occur later in the plural, as demanded by the altered circumstances.

[20] *Ibid.*, passim.

[21] *Dict. of Christian Biography.* Art. *Cyprian.*

which existed already on the ground of traditional custom came to be reinforced by less worthy motives. These were not the kind of men to make matters easy for a Primate who insisted on perfect obedience to the canons, put down abuses with a strong hand, and in spite of his love of peace excommunicated such as defied his authority,[22] and threatened with a like measure those who refused to accept the terms laid down by him for the reception of the "lapsed." [23]

The resistance he met with in this latter controversy led to a schism. The deacon Felicissimus, who headed the opposition, was joined not merely by the fashionable and influential *lapsi* who declined all penance, but also by the confessors who, spoiled by flattery, regarded St. Cyprian's rejection of their intercession as a slight upon themselves and a belittling of the merits of the martyrs. We may be quite sure that the emissaries sent by the party of laxity to Rome spared no efforts to create a strong current of opinion against him there, and it is possible that his declaration to Stephen—"neither do we violence to any one"—was directed against their misrepresentations of his conduct. Nor must we forget that his great eloquence and the intellectual gifts which raised him head and shoulders above his brother-bishops laid him readily open to the accusation of unfairly using his superiority, and forcing his opinions on others less happily endowed.

That such accusations were made is implied in the frequency of his disclaimers. But evidence of a more direct nature is not wanting. Take, as an instance, the following passage in the treatise *De Rebaptismate*, written about this time by one of his opponents. The dispute, it is said, could not have arisen but for the lack of the necessary humility, and can lead to nothing but dissensions, jealousies, and schisms, "where no other fruit can be found but this, that one man, no matter who he be, should be lauded with empty praise by certain light-headed men." [24]

So much for the condition of affairs in Africa at the time the third synod was held.

[22] Ep. 42.

[23] Ep. 55, 4. These strong measures are sufficient evidence that when he speaks of judging no one, of allowing every bishop perfect freedom of choice, etc., he is referring to matters which in his judgment did not affect the integrity of the faith.

[24] *De Rebaptismate*, c. 1, passim. Hartel, vol. ii, p. 69.

The second synod, although more largely attended, failed to secure the unanimity which St. Cyprian desired, as may be inferred from the concluding passage in the synodic letter to Stephen already quoted.

We now come to the third synod, upon which the dispute turns. It met in the autumn of 256, following the second, therefore, within the same year. Some have thought that this short interval could be explained only on the supposition that the third synod was hurriedly summoned on the receipt of Stephen's rescript,—in order to solemnly protest against it. There is no need for any such supposition, as the procedure was quite normal.[25] But apart from this, his great energy and the conviction that he was "fighting for the honor and unity of the Church" are quite sufficient to explain St. Cyprian's eagerness to settle definitely the only outstanding question which disturbed the peace and quiet of his province.

As regards Pope Stephen, it has been asserted that six months were time enough for him to draft his answer, and that to suppose he took longer is unreasonable.

On the contrary, the supposition is perfectly reasonable and more likely to be true in fact. In a matter of such importance Stephen would certainly have acted with great deliberation, and he may well have followed the precedent set him by Pope Victor in the Paschal controversy, carefully inquiring into the customs of other Churches and holding synods before giving a final decision. The words used by Pope Zosimos in a letter addressed to the African Bishops during the Pelagian controversy have their application here also: "One must not decide without great deliberation that which requires to be examined with the gravest judgment."[26] As for the African bishops and St. Cyprian, they, on their side, did not press for an answer. There was, therefore, no reason why Stephen should hurry, and grave reasons why he should not.

[25] *Cf.* the so-called Apostolic Canons (No. 36) and the Fifth Canon of Nicæa. The time preceding Lent and the autumn of the same year are the dates given for the two yearly meetings of the synods. As the third synod met on September 1st, St. Cyprian was but following a custom which later on became law.

[26] *Constant. Epistolae Rom. Pontif.* 1, 974.

It seems convenient to consider his reply here, although in my opinion it followed, instead of preceding, the synod. And in this respect it is significant that the only direct knowledge we have of his answer is derived from documents written admittedly after the synod and unconnected with it.

St. Cyprian gives us in a letter to Bishop Pompeius the only portion of the Pope's answer that has been textually preserved. "If any should come to you," writes Stephen, "from any heresy whatsoever, let there be no innovation upon what has been handed down: that hands be imposed for penance, since heretics themselves do not baptize in a special way such as come to them, but only admit them to communion." [27]

A later portion of the same letter allows us to conjecture the reasons given in support of this decision. After violently attacking the argument from tradition,—especially the one drawn from heretical practice, Cyprian says: "Or if they attribute the effect of baptism to the *majesty of the name* in such wise that those wheresoever and howsoever baptized are judged to be renovated and sanctified . . . " St. Firmilian, to whom Cyprian forwarded a copy of Stephen's reply, says much the same thing: "This also is absurd, that Stephen and those who agree with him do not think it should be asked who was the baptizer, because the baptized could have received grace after the invocation of the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." [28] It would seem from these two extracts that Pope Stephen defended the traditional practice on just the same grounds that we should make use of to-day; that the efficacy of baptism was derived not from the internal dispositions of the minister, as St. Cyprian mistakenly thought,—but from the Sacrament itself as instituted by Christ.

Having now passed in review all the documents which have a bearing upon the third synod, we are in a better position to examine the synod itself. It met at Carthage, on the 1st of September, as its Acts inform us,[29] and was attended by eighty-seven

[27] Ep. 74. "Si qui ergo a quacumque haeresi venient ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in poenitentiam, cum ipsi haeretici proprie alterutrum ad se venientes non baptizent, sed communicent tantum."

[28] Ep. 75, 9.

[29] Hartel, vol. i, p. 435, seq.

bishops from the province of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, together with presbyters and deacons; the laity were also present in large numbers. It opened with the reading of four letters: I. A letter from Jabainus to Cyprian, asking for advice on the subject of re-baptism. II. Cyprian's reply, which contains an exhaustive exposition of his views as well as a refutation of those of his opponents. With this reply were included an abstract of the acts of the second synod, and a copy of Cyprian's letter to Quintus. III. The reply of Jabainus to Cyprian. IV. Cyprian's letter to Stephen embodying the findings of the second synod.[30]

After these letters had been read out, St. Cyprian said: "It remains that upon this same question we should each one give our opinion, judging no one nor removing anyone from the right of communion if he thinks differently. For no one of us sets himself up as a bishop of bishops, or forces his colleagues to the necessity of concurring by tyrannically frightening them, since every bishop has his own choice according to the competency[31] of his liberty and power, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another. But let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who singly and alone has the power both to set us up in the governing of His Church and to pass judgment on our action."

The priority of Stephen's reply rests almost exclusively on the interpretation to be given to certain expressions in this address. The mere fact that such expressions are applicable to Stephen's

[30] The second and fourth letters have been already referred to, principally in connection with the disclaimers with which they conclude.

[31] *Pro licentia libertatis . . . suae.* The Rev. F. W. Puller (*Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, 3d ed., p. 65) translates these words as follows: "According to the *absolute independence* of his liberty" (italics mine). What good purpose can be served by such a palpable mistranslation? The declaration so unwarrantably placed on St. Cyprian's lips is not only contradicted by the Saint's own practice, but is openly at variance with the Church discipline of the time. So far from being absolutely independent, bishops were bound, in their administration, to follow canonical procedure, and departure from it or from established usage invariably evoked strong protest. The whole of the re-baptism controversy is an instance in point, and the attitude of St. Cyprian at this synod alone in regard to his dissenting brother-bishops ought to have made Mr. Puller's addition to his speech impossible. *Cf.* "*licentia sacrificandi*," Ep. 73, c. 8.

action, as it appeared to Cyprian in a moment of great irritation[32] does not carry with it the necessary conclusion that, as a fact, they *were so applied in this instance.* Such an inference is altogether invalid, besides resting, as we have seen, on a document which is admittedly post-synodic.

I have already said sufficient to show that there is no need to go outside Africa, or beyond purely local conditions to find a perfectly natural and straightforward explanation. So far from being a veiled and indirect cut at Pope Stephen, the address supplies us with no more than a summing up and a repetition of expressions already occurring in the letters just read out,—and the slight alterations which occur are just such as would grow out of the altered circumstance that Cyprian is no longer writing to individuals, but speaking to a large assembly of bishops, clergy, and laity.

It was of the greatest importance for the success of the synod that his African opponents, who, if not actually present, were assuredly watching its proceedings with the greatest vigilance, should have no shadow of a reason for repeating their old accusations about his overbearing behavior, or their sneer at the "light-headed men" who followed him and belauded him with vain praise. "He was doing violence to no one."[33] It was therefore essential that liberty of speech should be emphasized and safeguarded,—all the more so, as it was in Cyprian's judgment merely a question of disciplinary practice as to which there ought to be a difference of opinion without loss to the integrity of the faith, and therefore without any breach of the "divine concord and peace."

I will set down side by side what St. Cyprian actually said at the synod,—and what was contained in the letters just read out, or in letters written previously and confessedly before there

[32] *Cf.* his letter to Pompeius (74), a *post-synodic* letter. This has been challenged because Cyprian does not refer to the synod; but why should he, in writing to a bishop who had been represented at it by a deputy? *Cf.* vot. 83. Pompeius had asked Cyprian for some account of what Stephen had written, a quite unnecessary course, one would imagine, if the synod had had any connection with the Pope's decree.

[33] Ep. 72 to Stephen.

was any question of a direct conflict with Rome on this subject. It will be seen at a glance that the speech adds nothing new, and supplies no evidence that a new element, *i.e.*, papal intervention, had meanwhile entered into the discussion.

The Opening Speech.	*Expressions that had just preceded it.*
Singuli quid sentiamus proferamus, neminem judicantes . . . ,	Nemini praescribentes aut praejudicantes quominus unusquisque episcoporum quod putat faciat. (Ep. 73, 26.)* [34]
aut a jure communicationis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes,	salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiae vinculo quaedam propria . . . retinent. (Ep. 72, 3.)* Cum quibus divinam concordiam et dominicam pacem tenemus. (Ep. 73, 26.)*
neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit.[35]	An tu qui te episcopum episcopi . . . constituis? (Ep. 66, 3.)
aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit.	Quâ in re nec nos vim cuique facimus aut legem damus. (Ep. 72, 3.)*
quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium.	quando habeat in ecclesiae administratione voluntatis suae arbitrium liberum unusquisque praepositus. (Ep. 72, 3.)* unusquisque quod putet faciat habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem. (Ep. 73, 26.)*
tamque [36] judicari ab alio non possit quam nec ipse possit alterum judicare, sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi.	unusquisque praepositus rationem actus sui Domino redditurus. (Ep. 72, 3.)*

[34] The asterisk denotes passages read out immediately before the address.

[35] A fitting expression, I think, in the mouth of one bishop addressing eighty-six brother-bishops, and wishing to emphasize the perfect equality and freedom of all as to the question at issue. That Tertullian used this same expression of Pope Zephyrinus is no proof that Cyprian used it of Pope Stephen. It is a coincidence which, I suspect, has been allowed more weight than was due to it.

[36] A corollary of *per licentia . . . potestatis suae.* So long as a bishop did not exceed the degree of liberty and power conferred upon him by the Canons, his action was no concern of his brother-bishops. For the exercise of his just rights he was amenable to his conscience and to God alone. This passage supplies the reason of the opening sentence: "It remains that upon this same question we should each one give our opinion judging no one . . . . "

For in thus expressing their opinions, and in acting upon them, the bishops were within their right, according to St. Cyprian's view. Read in this obvious sense, the address is one connected and homogeneous whole.

qui unus et solus habet potestatem et praeponendi nos in Ecclesiae suae gubernatione.[37]	Deus qui sacerdotes facit. (Ep. 66, 1.) Si majestatem Dei qui sacerdotes ordinat Christi consideras. (*Ibid.* 9.)
et de actu nostro judicandi.	Animadverto . . . post Deum judicem te velle—non dicam de me—sed de Dei et Christi judicio judicare. (Ep. 43, 1.)

The comparison just made and the short account of the actual state of the re-baptism controversy in Africa which preceded it, have at least established this much: that it is not permissible to maintain that the address must necessarily be understood as directed against Stephen. They supply a much simpler and much more natural explanation.

However, in seeking to determine the meaning of expressions not otherwise determined, previous parallel utterances and circumstances of time and place are not the only things to be considered; due weight must also be allowed to the character of the man who utters them, especially when his character is strongly marked. Now to read into the "tyrannicus terror" and the "unus et solus" an underhand thrust at Stephen and a veiled challenge to his authority, is to tax St. Cyprian with a procedure absolutely at variance with his well-known singleness of purpose, with his perfect straightforwardness, and with the fearlessness he displayed in the discharge of his duty, a fearlessness sufficiently attested by the strong line he took in the matter of the "lapsed," and by his glorious martyrdom. And here, fighting though he was "for the unity and honor of the Church," we are to write him down guilty of an act of conspicuous weakness, a weakness that was willing to wound from behind and afraid to strike openly, and perfectly

[37] It need hardly be pointed out that these words are not to be understood to the exclusion of all delegated authority and the hierarchic constitution of the Church. For a valid ordination, St. Cyprian requires election by neighboring bishops. Nor in ordinary cases world he recognize Cornelius until he was satisfied that his election had taken place according to canonical procedure. This was to him the ordinary proof of election by God. (Ep. 44.) And as for judging,—he went much farther than this when he excommunicated Bishop Repostus. His interference in the case of Basilides and Martialis, both bishops, shows too that he did not consider himself as precluded from acting strongly *outside* his own province, when grave interests were at stake, and when he considered his brother-bishops had exceeded "the competency of their liberty and power."

unintelligible in a man who had had the courage to summon all the bishops of his province together to protest against Stephen and his pretensions. Strange, too, that his courage should have failed him at a moment when he was "backed by an army of bishops moving like one man under him,"[38] when he had just declared, according to the Anglican theory, that he was "absolutely independent," and amenable only to the judgment of God.

Besides this, veiled allusions were out of place in the face of an issue which from its importance demanded the utmost plainness and openness. If the assembled bishops had a right to express themselves freely on the question of re-baptism, how far greater was their right to decide freely whether they would break with Rome or not? And how were they to decide unless the issue was placed clearly before them? Instead of this, we should have St. Cyprian stooping to an act of duplicity; assuring them that they were met together to promote the unity and honor of the Church, whilst knowing all the time that they were by their acts wrecking its unity and separating themselves from one to be in communion with whom was, in his own words, "to be in communion with the Catholic Church."[39] He had placed the alternative of obedience or excommunication plainly before them in the controversy about the lapsed; why suppress all direct mention of Stephen's threat of excommunication here, if he knew of it? Still less reason could there be for such a suppression and for these round-about and devious ways, if the bishops already knew of Stephen's letter and threat. What would have been uppermost in every one's mind would certainly have found clear and unmistakable utterance.

The explanation, therefore, which rejects these veiled allusions and this suppression of an important issue in favor of a simpler and more direct procedure has the further advantage of being

[38] *Cf.* Dr. Benson, Art. Cyprian, *Dict. Christian Biography.*

[39] Ep. 55, 1. Ut (Cornelius) sciret, te secum, hoc est cum catholica ecclesia communicare. *Cf.* the passage from the "De unitate Ecclesiae," C. 4: "Whoso strives against the Church and resists, whoso abandons the Chair of Peter upon whom the Church is founded, does he flatter himself he is in the Church?" It will be interesting to note how Anglicans will deal with this passage, which was once a trusty weapon in their armory, and has now been turned against them by Dom Chapman and Professor Harnack. *Cf.* The London *Tablet*, May 23, 1903.

in strict accordance with everything we know of St. Cyprian's character.

I now proceed to examine the acts of the synod. They stand to the documents read out at the beginning, and especially to the opening address, in much the same relation as do the contents of a book to its preface. Thus, on the theory that the Council had been convened to reaffirm the invalidity of heretical baptism *as against Stephen's decree*, and *in spite of his threat of excommunication*, the first thing we should naturally expect to find in its recorded acts would be a very distinct reference to these two matters.

As a fact, not one out of the 87 *vota*[40] betrays the slightest hint of any excommunication hanging over the synod, and, with one or two exceptions, they are mere repetitions of the arguments used by St. Cyprian in the letters just read out.

The bishops can take up and rub in points made by him against his African opponents;[41] they can express in strong terms their astonishment and irritation that some "of their own brethren," some "of their own colleagues," should "presume" to think differently, should flatter heretics, betray the Church's baptism, and become "prevaricators of the truth"; but as for the man who has overthrown their labors in two previous synods and forbids their continuance under severe threats, who sets before them, as one reason for his decision, the practice of heretics whom they have just execrated together with their baptism—against *him* these fiery Africans have no single word of clear protest, complaint, or indignant remonstrance, whilst sparing none of these things to their dissenting colleagues. They do not even rise to the process of indirect aspersion, despite the supposed encouragement of their Primate, whom they follow in all else. To any one who has even the slenderest knowledge of human nature and of the unrestrained

[40] Dr. Benson pithily hits off their general character as follows: "Each bishop by seniority delivered his opinion, of which we have a verbal report: from some a good argument, from some a text, an antithesis, an analogy, or a fancy; here a rhetorical sentence, there a solecism, or an unfinished clause; a simple restatement, a personality, a fanaticism: two of the juniors vote with the majority on the ground of inexperience. But on the whole we must admire the temper and ability of so large a number of speakers."

[41] *Cf.* Ep. 71, 1, and Vot. 35; Ep. 73, 4, and Vot. 52.

procedure, only too common in the synods and Councils of the early Church, this exceeding forbearance of the Africans in regard to Stephen is inexplicable, if his peremptory decree had been previously known.

Let us look more closely at the *vota* which constitute the recorded acts of the synod. If any one will take the trouble to classify them, he will find that the argument common to the greater number is one in which the invalidity of heretical baptism is deduced directly or indirectly from the absence of proper internal dispositions in the baptizer. Thus some thirty-four. That custom should give way to truth, that the power of forgiving sins was given by Christ to His Church, and not to heretics; that to admit their baptism is to betray that of the Church, etc., are arguments which recur in varied forms.

Now, on referring to the documents read at the opening of the synod, we find that the arguments just mentioned are but a restatement, a repetition, with far less originality of thought or expression than Dr. Benson's description would lead one to expect. But what we look for, and look for in vain, is something, whether argument or statement, which we could fix upon and say: *This* is aimed at Stephen, *this* at his threat of excommunication, *this* at his own peculiar argument from heretical practice. The bishops do everything but the chief thing they—on the theory that I am combating—were convoked to do: refute and confute Stephen. Arguments peculiar to their African opponents are singled out and answered. The argument peculiar to Stephen, which subsequently drew from St. Cyprian such unmeasured criticism, is not even alluded to.

Another important feature to notice is that both Cyprian and the bishops allow, *in the synod*, that custom is against them, and on the side of their adversaries; but, as one of them quaintly puts it, "Christ did not say, 'I am custom,' but, 'I am truth.' Let, therefore, custom give way to truth."[42]

When, however, Cyprian sets himself to refute Stephen in a letter written after the synod,[43] he is no longer of the same mind. Far from allowing that tradition and custom are on the Pope's side, he strives to prove that such is in no wise the case. He

[42] *Cf.* Vot. 30, 63, etc. [43] Ep. 74, 2.

declares there is no trace of any such custom in the Gospels or in the writings of the Apostles, and that to ascribe to them approval of heretical baptism is to defame them. How explain this remarkable change of front, except by saying that the argument from traditional usage, whilst confined to his adversaries in Africa, did not strike Cyprian as presenting any particular difficulty; but that when the bishop of the "ecclesia principalis" lent it the weight of his authority, he was forced to reconsider his attitude in its regard?

So, too, with the argument from heretical practice. It had been passed over in silence at the synod—if indeed it was known. But in this same letter, written subsequently, it draws from St. Cyprian some of the sharpest criticism he ever penned: "To this degree of misery then is the Church of God and the Spouse of Christ descended, that she should follow the example of heretics, that for the celebration of the heavenly sacraments light should borrow instruction from darkness, and Christians should do what anti-Christs do! What blindness of spirit . . . what iniquity!"[44]

There is the strongest presumption that this argument would have met with like treatment at the synod, if Cyprian and the bishops had been aware of it. To them the heretics were no better than "high-priests of the devil,"[45] "worse than pagans;"[46] and two of the bishops were of opinion "that these blasphemous heretics . . . should be execrated, and therefore *exorcised* and baptized."[47] Exorcism first, and *then* baptism! "A painfully early development," remarks Dr. Benson.

We are faced, then, with this extraordinary state of affairs: At a synod "hurriedly" convened to oppose Stephen, both the president and the assembled bishops agree with Stephen that traditional usage is on his side. After the synod, the president strongly denies that such is the case.

At the synod, an argument peculiar to Stephen, one which was easily misunderstood and so liable to a crushing refutation, is passed over in silence. After the synod, it is seized upon and torn to pieces. Surely no satisfactory explanation is possible except the supposition that the third synod was convened and

[44] Ep. 74, 4.
[45] Vot. 1.
[46] Vot. 37.
[47] Vot. 31, 37.

held *without any reference to Stephen, and before his decree and threat of excommunication reached Africa.*

It is useless to labor the point further. The argument to be drawn from silence is often a precarious one and liable to great abuse. But where there is a strong presumption that a fact or facts would have been mentioned by a writer or speaker, if known to him, it is a valid inference from his silence, that he did not know of them. In this case the presumption is only made stronger by the contradictory hypotheses put forward to weaken it.

A recent Anglican writer thinks that St. Cyprian suppressed Stephen's decree, because of certain abusive expressions it "may" have contained, and its "arrogant" tone and threats would, if recorded in the acts of the synod, have caused a scandal throughout Africa. He also thinks that the silence of the *vota* on the subject may be accounted for partly by their nature and partly by saying that the bishops would be on their guard against any "open exhibition of irritation when they spoke at a public session."[48]

Now, either the bishops knew of Stephen's decree and its contents, or they did not. If they knew, the scandal was bound to follow their return to their dioceses, where they would no longer be bound by the restrictions—wholly imaginary at this period—of a public session. This unique conspiracy of silence was then useless and nugatory.

If they did not know, the scandal might indeed have been averted. *But what becomes of their pent-up irritation?* There was nothing for them to be irritated about, so far as Stephen was concerned.

But granted that Stephen's decree did answer fully to the description Cyprian gives of it, in his angry letter to Pompeius, and that it did contain remarks which were "proud or irrelevant, or self-contradictory, set down without discretion or foresight."[49] It was not to combat *irrelevancies* that the synod was convoked. The kernel of the decree, preserved to us textually and already quoted, has nothing offensive about it. The simple course would have been for Cyprian to have read out *that* to the synod, and not

[48] Rev. F. W. Puller, *ibid.*, p. 455.

[49] Ep. 74, 1.

suppressed the whole, and with it the *raison d'être* of the synod, because of some minor blemishes of expression and style, or even abusive expressions against himself. In so acting, he would only have been following a precedent set by himself under conditions not dissimilar.[50]

If the reasoning pursued in this article be correct, we come to this final conclusion.

St. Cyprian's opening address was not a piece of mummery intelligible only to himself; neither did he descend to the undignified expedient of venting his irritation against Stephen in a series of more or less veiled cuts and thrusts. But what he meant, he said openly and plainly; and we find his meaning reflected, with the same directness and plainness, in the recorded opinions of the assembled bishops. And his meaning was that they were met together for the third time, not to imperil the unity of the Church, but to safeguard it and strengthen it by eliminating, as far as possible, a certain diversity of practice which was disturbing the peace of the Church in Africa.

Of an act of defiance against the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome there is no sign.

The vexed question as to the subsequent relations between Stephen and Cyprian does not properly fall within the scope of this article, but it seems desirable to say a word or two on this subject on account of their close connection.

Did Stephen carry out his threat of excommunication? The answer to the question seems to turn upon the two kinds of excommunication in use in the early centuries, and the difference between them. One carried with it little more than a suspension of friendly relations, of the duties of hospitality. It did not affect the powers or jurisdiction of the bishop within his own diocese, but merely his intercourse with outsiders. The other, which we might call

[50] Letters from Pope Cornelius announcing his election reached Carthage whilst the synod of 251 was still sitting. Novatian sent letters at the same time, containing a temperate protest against his election. *Both sets of documents* were laid before the synod. What Cyprian suppressed was the mass of scandalous charges which followed; and at a time when the validity of Cornelius' election had been attested by his own deputies now returned. By what process of reasoning Mr. Puller can find here a precedent for the suppression of the whole of Stephen's decree by Cyprian, it is hard to see.

the "excommunicatio major" carried with it "anathema," deposition, and exclusion from the body of the Church Catholic. It placed the excommunicated bishop in a state of schism.[51]

Dionysius the Great begged Pope Stephen not to carry his threat into execution against the Orientals; and Eusebius, to whom we owe the knowledge of this fact, writing with the correspondence between the two under his eyes, merely states that Stephen was *angry* with Cyprian—an inadequate expression to indicate the "excommunicatio major," if such had taken place. But we need not lay any particular stress on his testimony, as it is wanting in definiteness.[52]

St. Augustine states positively, that *no schism* took place. "The peace of Christ," he says, "won the victory in their hearts (Stephen's and Cyprian's) so that . . . no schism should arise between them;"[53] on the other hand, there is Firmilian's equally positive statement that Stephen did "break the peace" against Cyprian, and not only refused to receive the delegated bishops of the third synod on their arrival in Rome, but forbade any of the brethren to extend to them the ordinary usages of hospitality.[54] Yet he says no word that implies more than the suspension of the usual friendly intercourse, etc., between Rome and Carthage. His statement, therefore, does not contradict St. Augustine's, who speaks clearly and definitely of schism—a very different thing.

The Donatists made St. Cyprian's error about the validity of Baptism the starting point of their heresy, and were loud in claiming him as their protagonist. In arguing against them St. Augustine again and again recurs to the "argumentum ad hominem": "St. Cyprian remained true to the unity of the Church; whereas you are cut away from the unity that he kept. Follow him rather in his love of unity than in his error."[55] And he does so without any fear of being contradicted by his keen-eyed and

[51] *Cf.* De Smedt, *Dissert. in prim. aet. Eccl.*, p. 70. Jungmann, *Dissert. in hist. Eccl.*, I, 337.

[52] Euseb. H. E., VII, 3 and 5.

[53] "Vicit pax Christi in cordibus eorum (Stephani et Cypriani) ut . . . nullum inter eos schisma oriretur." De Cap. c. Donat., V, C. 25, n. 36.

[54] Ep. 75, 6, 25.

[55] *Cf.* De Cap. c. Donat., VII, C. 1, n. 1, passim. II, c. 3, n. 4.

watchful adversaries.[56] We may take it then that he was but stating the unbroken tradition about St. Cyprian, handed down in the African Church, whose pride and veneration in his regard it would be difficult to exaggerate. And for this reason St. Augustine's testimony is in no wise shaken by the contention, however sound, that he was unacquainted with the letter of Firmilian.

Less than a year after the third synod St. Stephen was put to death in the persecution of Valerian, in August, 257. That peace reigned between Cyprian and St. Stephen's successor, Pope Xystus, we know from Cyprian himself;[57] and the report of his deacon Pontius, who calls Xystus a "good and peaceful bishop."[58]

On the 14th of September, 258, St. Cyprian, in his turn, laid down his life for the Faith, "his error in its regard compensated for by the abundance of his charity and purged away by the sword of his passion."[59]

P. ST. JOHN, S.J.

Valkenberg, Holland.

[56] There is no sign that the Donatists ever challenged the accuracy of St. Augustine in this matter so important for them. The Donatist historian Petilian even describes Stephen's episcopate as "blameless," whilst heaping "incredible calumnies upon the other bishops of the Roman Church." *Cf.* St. Aug. De unico bap. c. Pet. c. 16, n. 27, and c. 14, n. 23.

[57] Ep. 80. [58] *Cf.* Cyprian's *Vita*, C. 14. Hartel, vol. ii.

[59] St. Aug. De bap. c. Donat., I, C. 18, n. 28.

It would not be surprising if at no very distant date the prevailing view among Anglicans on the subject of the Primacy in the early Church were to receive as rude a shock as their late continuity theory—and, indeed, from much the same quarter. Compare the two subjoined passages illustrative, one of the subjective, the other of the objective method of writing history. Mr. Puller thus sums up the results of the third synod: "As it was in the Paschal controversy, so it was in the Baptismal controversy; it was Rome that was compelled to give way . . . Africa and Asia Minor retained their baptismal discipline unchanged, *and had the joy of welcoming back the Roman Church after its wanderings* into the straight path of Catholic peace and charity." (*Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.* 3d ed., p. 71.)

The following is the estimate of the late Dr. Benson: "Over the theory promulgated by one of Cyprian's powers and character, backed by an army of bishops moving as one man under him, . . . *Stephen's triumph* without a council, against remonstrances from the East and hindered by his own pretentiousness and uncharitableness, *was great.* It deserved to be, for Rome represented freedom, comprehensiveness, and safe latitude." (*Dict. Christian Biography:* Cyprian). [Italics mine in both cases.]

Analecta.

EX ACTIS LEONIS XIII.

Solemnia Quinquagenaria Definitionis Dogmaticae B.M.V. Immaculatae Conceptionis.

Ai nostri diletti figli Vincenzo cardinale Vannutelli, Mariano cardinale Rampolla del Tindaro, Domenico cardinale Ferrata, Guiseppe Calasanzio cardinale Vives.

Signori Cardinali:

Da molte parti Ci è stato manifestato il vivo desiderio dei fedeli di celebrare con istraordinarie solennità il cinquantesimo anniversario della dommatica definizione dell' Immacolata Concezione della Vergine. Quanto tale brama torni gradita al Nostro cuore è agevole immaginarlo. La pietà verso la Madra di Dio, non solo è stata fra le Nostre più soavi affezioni fin dai teneri anni, ma è per Noi uno dei più validi presidî concessi dalla Provvidenza alla Chiesa cattolica. In tutti i secoli ed in tutte le lotte e persecuzioni la Chiesa ebbe ricorso a Maria, e ne ottenne sempre conforto e difesa. E poichè i tempi che corrono sono così procellosi e pieni di minacce per la Chiesa stessa, Ci gode l' animo e si apre a spernanza nel vedere i fedeli che, colta la propizia occasione

del menzionato cinquantenario, vogliono con unanime slancio di fiducia e di amore rivolgersi a Colei che è invocata Aiuto dei Cristiani. Si aggiunge poi a renderci cara la bramata solennità cinquantenaria, l' esser Noi unico superstite fra quanti, sia Cardinali sia Vescovi, facevano corona al Nostro Predecessore nell' atto della promulagazione del dommatico decreto. Essendo però Nostra intenzione che le feste cinquantenarie abbiano quell' impronta di grandezza, che si conviene a questa Nostra Roma, e sieno tali da servir di stimolo e regola alla pietà dei cattolici di tutto il mondo; abbiamo determinato di formare una *Commissioni Cardinalizia*, a cui spetti ordinarle e dirigerle. A membri di siffatta Commissione nominiamo voi, Signori Cardinali. E nella certezza che, colle sapienti vostre cure, saranno interamente appagate le Nostre e le comuni brame, pegno dei celesti favori vi impartiamo l' apostolica benedizione.

LEO PP. XIII.

Dal Vaticano, 26 maggio 1903.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

DUBIUM CIRCA ADMISSIONEM AD VOTA SOLLEMNIA, TRIENNIO NONDUM EXPLETO.

Nomine plurium Superiorum regularium S. Congregationi proponitur dubium circa admissionem ad vota sollemnia, triennio nondum expleto. Cum de jure communi superior ante admissionem candidati ad vota sollemnia expleto triennio debeat exquirere votum Capituli mere consultativum, nequaquam decisivum (quod Capitulo convenit solum quoad admissionem ad vota simplicia), quaeritur circa triennium nondum expletum, sed Apostolica dispensatione abbreviatum:

1° Utrum ob temporis abbreviationem per dispensationem Apostolicam votum consultivum Capituli transmutetur in decisivum?

2° Utrum Superior debeat exquirere votum Capituli (sive consultivum sive decisivum) antequam supplicatur pro gratia vel ipsa obtenta?

3° Utrum standum sit praxi communiori, iuxta quam superior

ante expostulationem dispensationis exquirit votum Capituli mere consultivum, adnotando tamen in ipsa supplicatione quale fuerit iudicium Capituli circa personam candidati, quin postea, obtenta S. Sedis dispensatione, alterum votum expostulet?

Sacra Congregatio Eminentissimorum et Reverendissimorum S. R. E. Cardinalium negotiis et consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium praeposita, omnibus mature perpensis, ad proposita dubia respondit:

Ad 1 ^{um} et 2 ^{um}, providebitur in 3°.

Ad 3 ^{um}, *Affirmative.*

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis die 26 Januarii 1903.

D. *Card.* Ferrata, *Praef.*
Ph. Giustini, *Secret.*

E SACRA RITUUM CONGREGATIONE.

De benedictione domorum in Sabbato Sancto.

I.

Ab hodierno Parocho loci N., dioeceseos N., nuper sequentia postulata huic S. Congregationi subiecta sunt, nempe:

1° An ob extensionem paroeciae benedictio domorum in Sabbato Sancto fieri valeat horis vespertinis Feriae VI in Parasceve?

2° Et quatenus negative, an in casu obtineri possit indultum?

3° An benedictio domorum in Sabbato Sancto sit de iuribus parochialibus?

Sacra Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, respondendum censuit:

Negative ad I et ad II iuxta Decretum 3645 "*Isclama*" 20 Novembris 1885, ad II; et in casu benedictio domorum poterit fieri durante hebdomada octavae Paschatis.

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Atque ita rescripsit, die 7 Martii 1903.

L. † S. S. *Card.* Cretoni, *Praef.*
† D. Panici, *Archiep. Laodicen., Sec.rius.*

II.

IN ASSOCIANDIS CADAVERIBUS, SOCIETATES CATHOLICAE IN HABITU LAICALI CUM VEXILLIS BENEDICTIS, SEQUI DEBENT FERETRUM.

Hodiernus Praepositus Clero Iesu et Mariae Civitatis et Dioecesis Stabian. seu Castri Maris, de consensu sui R.mi Episcopi, a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione sequentis dubii solutionem humillime expetivit; nimirum: An in associationibus cadaverum societates catholicae in habitu laicali cum vexillis benedictis possint praecedere Clerum cum Cruce, an debeant sequi feretrum?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, respondendum censuit: *Negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad secundam.* Atque ita rescripsit.

Die 14 Martii 1903.

L. † S. S. *Card.* CRETONI, *Praef.*

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

III.

CAPPELLA PRINCIPALIS SEMINARIORUM SOLEMNITER BENEDICTA CUM SPECIALI TITULO AEQUIPARATUR ECCLESIIS QUOAD IURA S. TITULARIS.

Proposito dubio: *Utrum Cappella principalis Seminariorum solemniter benedicta cum speciali titulo, gaudeat privilegiis, quae competunt Sanctis vel Mysteriis titularibus cuiusvis Ecclesiae, sive Oratorii publici solemniter benedicti, nempe, ut in Oratione* A cunctis, *et in Suffragiis Sanctorum* ad Laudes et ad Vesperas *Titularis nominetur?*

Sacra Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, rescribendum censuit: *Affirmative* iuxta Decreta n. **4025**, diei 5 Iunii 1899, ad V, et n. **4043**, diei 27 Iunii 1899, ad I et ad VIII.

Atque ita rescripsit.

Die 14 Martii 1903.

L. † S. S. *Card.* CRETONI, *Praef.*

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

CIRCA TRANSLATIONES SODALITATUM B. MARIAE VIRG. IMM. IN GALLIIS.

Beatissime Pater: Augustinus Veneziani Pro-Procurator Generalis Congregationis Missionis, ad pedes S. V. humiliter provolutus exponit quae sequuntur: a suppressione jam peracta in Gallia vel peragenda plurium Domorum Sororum seu Puellarum a caritate S. Vincentii a Paulo, Sodalitates B. M. V. Immaculatae vulgo "le Figlie di Maria" nuncupatae, apud praefatas Sorores institutae—vi Rescripti Pontificii diei 20 Junii 1847, nec non Litterarum in forma Brevis diei 19 Septembris 1876—non parvum detrimentum sentient ex defectu sedis vel loci, quo puellae convenire consueverant, peracturae, sub directione earumdem Sororum, devotiones erga B. Matrem, nec non functiones Sodalitatis proprias, v. g. consilia, electiones officialium, receptiones etc. Ad praecavendam igitur harum Sodalitatum,—quae tot fructus salutis aeternae in vinea D.ni proferunt,—dissolutionem, humilis orator, nomine sui Superioris Generalis, instanter implorat, ut praedictae Sodalitates possint, sine damno indulgentiarum, quibus ditatae sunt, prosequi suas devotiones, nec non functiones antea usitatas, vel in Ecclesia paroeciae, in cujus ambitu erat domus suppressa vel supprimenda, vel (si commode fieri possit) apud alias domos Sororum, quae forte iisdem in locis a periculo suppressionis evaserint. Et Deus, etc.

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, utendo facultatibus a SS. D. N. Leone Pp. XIII sibi specialiter tributis, quatenus opus sit, benigne annuit pro gratia juxta preces, dummodo tamen translatio praefatarum Sodalitatum fiat de consensu Ordinariorum. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus. Datum Romae ex Sec.ria ejusdem S. C. die 29 Aprilis 1903.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praef.*

† FRANCISCUS SOGARO, *Archiep. Amiden., Secr.ius.*

II.

CIRCA EXTENSIONEM INDULTI ALTARIS PRIVILEGIATI.

Michael Camós, Cappellanus Confessarius Monialium Cisterciensium Monasterii Sanctae Mariae de Chatinis in civitate ac dioecesi Gerundensi, ab hac S. Cong. Indulgentiarum sequentis dubii solutionem humiliter expostulabat:

Utrum Missae conventuales de Sancto vel de die, celebrandae diebus quibus Missae privatae de Requie permittuntur, gaudere possint indulto Altaris privilegiati?

S. Cong. audito Consultorum voto, respondendum mandavit: "*Affirmative.*"

Datum Romae ex Sec.ria ejusdem S. Cong. die 29 Aprilis 1903.

L † S. A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praefectus.*

† FRANCISCUS SOGARO, *Archiep. Amiden., Sec.rius.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE SUPER NEGOT. ECCL. EXTR.

CAUSAE JUDICATAE IN PRIMA INSTANTIA A CURIA ARCHIEP. DE ANTEQUERA, IN POSTERUM IUDICENTUR IN SECUNDA INSTANTIA A CURIA TLASCALEN. LOCO CURIAE TEHUANTEPECEN.

Ex Audientia SSmi die 28 Aprilis 1903.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo divina Providentia PP. XIII, referente infrascripto S. Congregationis Negotiis Ecclesiasticis Extraordinariis praepositae Secretario, consulere cupiens faciliori et promptiori agnitioni ecclesiasticarum iudicialium controversiarum Archidioeceseos de Antequera, ad preces eiusdem Archidioecesis Antistitis et habito voto Episcoporum Tehuantepecen. et Tlascalen., R. P. D. Episcopo Tlascalen. seu Angelorum facultates tribuit necessarias et opportunas, ut, ex delegata Sedis Apostolicae auctoritate, cognoscere possit in secunda instantia et iudicare tum matrimoniales tum alias fori ecclesiastici causas, quae in prima instantia ab Archiepiscopo de Antequera, vel, sede vacante, a Vicario Capitulari eiusdem Archidioeceseos iudicata fuerint et quae usque hodie in eadem instantia cognoscebantur et iudicabantur ab Episcopo Tehuantepecen., servata, quoad matrimoniales causas, Constitutione Benedicti PP. XIV quae incipit "*Dei miseratione*"; eaque in primis lege, ut in singulis actis expressa fiat mentio specialis Sedis Apostolicae delegationis, et quoad omnes praedictas causas servatis caeteris, quae Iure Canonico praescripta sunt. Super quibus idem SSmus Dominus mandavit hoc edi Decretum et in Acta superius memoratae S. Congregationis referri.

Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.—Datum Romae e Secretaria eiusdem S. Congr., die, mense et anno praedictis.

L. † S.

† PETRUS, *Archiep. Caesaren., Sec.rius.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

APOSTOLIC LETTER appointing Cardinals Vincenzo Vannutelli, Rampolla, Ferrata, and Vives a special Commission to arrange for the suitable celebration in 1904 of the fiftieth anniversary of the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady.

S. CONGREGATION OF BISHOPS AND REGULARS answers questions as to whether candidates may be allowed to take solemn vows, *triennio nondum expleto.*

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES:

1. Decides the question of jurisdiction of pastors in blessing homes on Holy Saturday.
2. Catholic Societies in lay dress when joining in funeral processions, take rank after the coffin.
3. The main chapel of seminaries, if it is dedicated and has a special titular, enjoys the same rights and privileges as other titular churches.

S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES:

1. Makes provision for the translation of Sodalities of the Blessed Virgin in France, owing to the closing of convents where some of these sodalities used to meet.
2. The Community Mass of a Saint or of the day, celebrated on days on which private requiem Masses are allowed, enjoys the indult of a privileged altar.

S. CONGREGATION OF EXTRAORDINARY ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS answers a doubt regarding the judicial decision of ecclesiastical controversies in the Archdiocese of Antequara.

THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DOGMATIC DEFINITION OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

The 8th of December of the coming year, 1904, will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. The Holy Father, wishing to make the occasion memorable, invites the Catholic world to renew by public celebrations its devotion to the august Mother of Christ, in the following Letter addressed to the Cardinals appointed as a special commission to commemorate the event with due pomp and honor. The original Italian version of the Holy Father's Letter will be found among the other Roman documents in the *Analecta* department of this number. Herewith follows an English translation:

"To our Beloved Sons, VINCENZO Cardinal VANNUTELLI, MARIANO Cardinal RAMPOLLA DEL TINARDO, DOMENICO Cardinal FERRATA, GIUSEPPE CALASANZIO Cardinal VIVES:

Lord Cardinals:

From many sides evidence has been manifested to Us of an earnest desire on the part of the Faithful to celebrate with extraordinary solemnity the fiftieth anniversary of the Definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. How dear to Our heart this desire has been may well be imagined. Devotion to the Mother of God not only has been from our tender years among our most cherished affections, but it is for us one of the most potent means of defence granted by Providence to the Catholic Church. At all times and in all trials and persecutions the Church has had recourse to Mary and in her has ever found solace and protection. And now that the days in which we live are so stormy and so fraught with menace for the Church herself, We are rejoiced and encouraged when We see the Faithful, seizing the auspicious opportunity presented by this fiftieth anniversary, turn with a unanimous impulse of love and confidence to Her who is invoked as the Help of Christians. This longed-for fiftieth anniversary is rendered all the dearer to Us, too, by the fact that we are the only survivors of all the Cardinals and Bishops who gathered around Our predecessor at the promulgation of the dogmatic decree. But as it is Our wish that the coming celebration shall have the stamp of greatness befitting this Rome of Ours and be of a nature to serve as a stimulus and as a guide to the devotion of Catholics

throughout the world, We have determined to form a Cardinalitial Commission, whose care it will be to regulate and direct them. You, Lord Cardinals, We nominate as members of this Commission. And with the certainty that through your wise solicitude Our own wishes and those of all will be fully gratified, We impart to you, as a pledge of heavenly favors, the Apostolic Benediction.

LEO XIII, POPE.

May 26, 1903."

The aforementioned Cardinals, in compliance with the expressed wishes of the Sovereign Pontiff, on the 31st of May last outlined the following programme of exercises as the general plan of the solemn festivities for the anniversary:

1. *Special Solemn Services* will be held in the Patriarchal Basilica of St. Peter's, in Rome, where the definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception was proclaimed, and in the Patriarchal Basilica of St. Mary Major. At these services Commissions will attend from every part of the world.

2. *A Universal Marian Congress* will be held in Rome.

3. *Establishment of a Marian Library in Rome*, composed of works on our Blessed Lady. These volumes will be offered to the Holy Father as a token of our love of the Mother of God, and will form an enduring monument of Mary's glory.

4. *Missions* are to be given during the year 1904 to prepare the Faithful for the solemnities of the occasion.

5. *First Communions* are to be marked with especial devotion and honor.

6. *Spiritual Exercises* are proposed to the members of Catholic Associations in preparation for the Feast.

7. *Pilgrimages*, numerous and frequent, to the various shrines of Our Lady throughout the world.

8. *Special services on the eighth day of every month*, beginning December 8, 1903, are to be held in certain churches to be selected by the Ordinary of each Diocese.

9. *Special Prayers* in honor of the Blessed Virgin are to be offered for the life of Pope Leo XIII, the sole survivor of the Bishops and Cardinals who were present at the Definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

10. *Special Works of Christian Charity* are urged according

to the nature and needs of each locality; and *Prayers for the Holy Souls*, especially for those who were most devout to the Blessed Virgin.

11. *Solemn Office and Mass of the Dead* at the Church of St. Lawrence outside the walls of Rome, for the soul of Pius IX, who defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

12. Particular marks of honor are to be paid, under the auspices of the *Collegium Cultorum Martyrum*, to the first early images of the Blessed Virgin, venerated in the Roman Catacombs.

13. Religious Communities of men and of women and devout Confraternities are especially requested to take part in the various movements undertaken with a view of honoring the Blessed Mother of God.

14. Besides the acts of homage suggested in this general programme, other pious exercises and festivities may be adopted, with the sanction and approval of the Cardinal Commissioners.

EARLIEST EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIANITY IN CHINA.

The current volume of the *Civiltà Cattolica* contains an interesting sketch[1] of an old monument unearthed in China during the seventeenth century, which shows that the Catholic religion had been introduced into that country long before the Saxons were converted to Christianity under the Carlovingian Emperors in Germany.

When, in 1517, Ferdinand Perez Andrada rediscovered, so to say, the Chinese continent, the Portuguese were allowed to found a colony upon the island of Sancian. Here, some thirty years later, St. Francis Xavier died, without being permitted actually to enter the land in which he had hoped to announce the glad tidings of the Gospel. Twice in the spring and autumn each year Portuguese merchants were allowed to pass the outer boundaries of the Celestial Empire for the purpose of trade. It was on one of these occasions that Nuñes Barreto, the Jesuit provincial—and shortly after him the Franciscan friar, Caspar a Cruce—gained entrance into the district of Canton. But these were not the first missionaries to China. Two hundred years before St. Ignatius

[1] "La Stela di Singan-Fu, monumento cristiano dell' VIII secolo in Cina." Serie XVIII, Vol. X, June 20, 1903.

CHRISTIAN MONUMENT OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY IN SINGAN FU (CHINA).

Inscription of Upper Section of Column.

(Enlarged. See over.)

had founded his magnificent army for the defence and propagation of the Kingdom of God, the sons of St. Francis of Assisi had been drawn to China in search of souls. Father John of Monte Corvino had entered Peking in 1292, where the Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, was at the same time enjoying the hospitality and confidence of the Emperor Cublai Khans, with full freedom to exercise and teach his religion. There are records also of those same times to show the existence of numerous flourishing Christian communities throughout the Chinese Empire which claimed their origin by tradition from the time of the Apostle St. Thomas. As a matter of fact, these Christians were tainted with the errors of Nestorianism, due probably to the preaching of missionaries sent to their country from Antioch, where that heresy was flourishing during the seventh century.[2]

At any rate it happened in 1625 that a Jesuit missionary, supervising some excavations near the city of Singan in the province of Schensi, discovered a large stone monument which contained a Chinese inscription indicating a Christian origin or relationship. At the head of the inscription was a cross prominently carved in relief. This might, of course, stand for some Buddhist epigram, frequent enough in the Chinese script of ancient date. Hence many of those who had attempted to decipher the legend in stone, believed that this was simply a Buddhist inscription. A portion of the slab was covered with Syriac characters, and these were supposed to be Sanscrit letters or figures which for a time no one attempted to interpret. Later on the inscription was more closely examined by two Jesuit scholars familiar with both Syriac and the old literature of China; and these (Fathers Frigault and Semedo) established its Christian origin, a fact now universally admitted.[3]

[2] The chief error of Nestorianism was the assertion of a dual personality in Christ. It implied that the divinity was entirely separated from the humanity of Christ; that He represented two distinct persons; and that Mary was the Mother of the Man, Christ, only. Catholic faith teaches, on the other hand, that, since the Second Person of the Godhead assumed our human nature, there are indeed *two natures* in Christ, but these two are united in *one person;* and that thus Mary, being the Mother of Christ, is justly called the Mother of God made Man.

[3] P. I. E. Heller, of the University of Innsbruck, Tyrol, has published the history, text and translation of the monument, under the title *Il monumento nestoriano di Singan-fu.*

What directs our special attention at this time to so interesting a relic of the early introduction of Christianity in China, is the fact that the evangelization of China is about to receive new impulses from our own country. The recent massacre of twenty thousand Christians through the uprising of the "Boxers," with the connivance of the Imperial Government, has, as appears, brought about a reaction, which is likely to force the "open door" not only for commerce and civilizing influences generally, but especially for Christianity. It will be remembered also, that our Philippine possessions not only border very closely on China, but contain a considerable Chinese population. Our missionaries, therefore, who formerly made their preparation for entry into China almost exclusively from Macao, will probably find it more convenient hereafter to acquire familiarity with Chinese customs and language, upon the American territory of the eastern islands, and thence cross the famous wall of Tschin-Ki-Hoang. And may it not be an aid toward gaining access to the strongly prejudiced mind of the yellow race, if our Christian missionaries can appeal—similarly to St. Paul when he pointed to the altar of the unknown God of the Athenians—to the faith of their Mongol ancestors of fifteen hundred years ago?

The monument of Singan-fu is a monolith slightly tapering toward the top, about ten feet high, three feet wide, and a foot and a half thick. It consists of three parts, the base supported by the rude form of a turtle, a figure which in the Eastern conception represents the slowly moving foundations of the earth. Upon this base rises a rectangular shaft or trunk, about six feet by three in dimension, and containing the main body of the inscription. The shaft is capped by a semicircular stone which contains a curiously carved relief representing two dragons, strangely entwined, and upholding in their left claws a round object, presumably a pearl, which forms the centre of the stone. It is well known that the dragon is the symbol of Chinese rule, and the figure of the dragon is often pictured in the attitude of lifting a pearl toward the clouds. This image corresponds with the Chinese expression, "The dragon is in love with the clouds and the pearl;" and perhaps expresses the idea that noble aspirations toward things celestial are characteristic of the imperial dignity of the Chinese

dynasty. The pearl itself forms the apex of a triangle which rests upon a square tablet containing nine ideographic signs in the old Chinese script. These are to be read, beginning at the right hand, downward. The triangular space itself contains the figure of a Latin cross, with ornamented corners, and rising out of the clouds. On each side of the clouds, at the lower ends of the triangle, are branches in flower, all roughly chiselled in the stone.

Without attempting any detailed interpretation of the symbolic meaning of this part of the monument, the thought suggests itself that as an expression of Christian doctrine the figures adopting the native forms of imagery are intended through the latter to lead the mind toward the higher Christian ideal. Thus the priceless pearl guarded by the imperial power which is symbolized in the double dragon, is the faith of Christ supported by and attained through the Cross. The Cross itself, expressive of the religion of Christ, springs from a heavenly source, symbolized by the clouds. The flowers are emblems of life, beauty, and goodness, emanating from, and encompassing the religion of the Cross. This thought is in harmony with what must be regarded as the most important feature of the monument, namely, the inscription.

The Inscription.

The inscription consists of thirty-two lines in old Chinese script, reading from the right downward, and covering about two-thirds of the frontal surface of the stone. The lower third is taken up with twenty-five lines of Syriac script, to be read from left to right. Here and there Chinese forms are introduced into the Syriac writing.

Down the sides of the column, in long lines, broken in various places, there are lists of proper names, making in all about 2,000 Chinese characters distributed in different parts of the monument.

The inscription in front is a brief summary of Christian doctrine and the principal rules of Christian life. It states the existence of one only God, Creator of heaven and earth, the placing of man in Paradise, the fall of Adam and the sad consequences of sin for the entire race. Next follows an exposition of the mystery of the Trinity, and of the Incarnation which was to atone for sin

and restore man to his first innocence. It is here that the interpreters of the inscription generally have recognized the Nestorian view of the Messianic coming, although there are others who, like Father Prémara, maintain that the passage is perfectly compatible with the true Catholic interpretation of the dogma of the Incarnation. After this there is a brief recounting of the institution of the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, the duty of the Sunday observance, and other liturgical precepts, notably the obligation of praying for the dead. To this is added an enumeration of the writings of the Old and the New Law, under two titles of the "Twenty-four Holy Ones," and the "Twenty-seven Books of Our Lord's Testament."

The next part is historical, and relates how the Christian faith came to be established in the region. This is clearly suggestive of the Nestorian propaganda which gained a strong foothold throughout the entire East during that early period. The writer of the inscription states how in 635 a priest by the name of Alapen (Olupen) came to Singan (then called Tschanggan, or Khumdan by the Syrian and Arab historians), the capital of the region over which Thaitsung of the Thang dynasty ruled at the time. The emperor kindly received the stranger, who brought a message from the land of Tatsin (a name which was generally given to the Roman Empire and included the Syrian provinces). The missionary was favored by the fact that the Thaitsung belonged to a race that traced relationship to Laotse, a famous philosopher and religious reformer of the sixth century before Christ, of whom a legend relates that, having instructed his people in heavenly wisdom, he left them and went to the land of the Tats, to the west, whence he never returned. Thus the faith of Christ grew, except under the reign of the cruel queen Wuhen, to the present day (*i. e.* the year 781 in which the monument was erected). The narrative ends with a poetic recapitulation of the story and adds two sets of dates, one of the Chinese chronology, the other of the Syrian (Seleucid), both of which coincide with the above mentioned year.[4]

[4] The passage referring to the date reads as follows: "Under the reign of the great dynasty of Thang, in the second year of the reign of Hiüenthung (Kihn-Kong), on the seventh day of the autumn month, this stone was erected, under the presi-

The lower part of the front contains a list (in Syriac, with frequent corresponding transliterations of Chinese appellatives) of names of persons instrumental in the erection of the monument, among which are Jazedbod di Khumdan, and Adamo (Kingtsing) as chief. The sides of the monument are likewise covered with names of some seventy persons, presumably ecclesiastics, in Syriac and Chinese script.

Originally the monument stood within the city of Singan, near the Christian (Nestorian) church; at present it rests against the wall of an old Buddhist temple at some distance from the city. Singan was at one time the capital of China and carries its glory back to the days when Moses led the Israelites from the Egyptian captivity. For two thousand years it remained queen of the far East, and the commercial centre whither caravans moved continually from south and west, so that the traditions of the establishment of Christianity going back to Apostolic times are not wholly imaginary. Thus Alapen may not have been the first to sow the seeds of the Gospel in the "Celestial Empire," though his influence in spreading the Nestorian heresy is sufficiently evident.

Some writers have contested the genuineness of the monument and credited the early Jesuit missionaries with an attempt to deceive. But authorities like Mosheim and Kist have learnedly discussed the value of the inscription as an historical document and decided without hesitation in favor of its authenticity. Mr. Alexander Williamson, a Protestant, acting under instructions from the Scotch Bible Society, went to Singan in 1866 to inspect the monument, and returned fully convinced of its genuine origin. The form and spelling of both the Chinese and Syriac expressions unmistakably point to a stage in the development of both languages, which takes the reader back over a thousand years. Furthermore there are collateral records which indicate the existence

dency of the Papaschi Adamo Kingtsing in the Church of China. A mandarin, by name Lien-si-Kijen of the title of Keao-ykun, wrote this inscription with his own hand.''—On the margin is inscribed the following: "In the days of the patriarch of the fathers, Mar Hananischo," and at the foot, likewise in Syriac: "In the Seleucid year 1092, Mar Jazedbod, priest and *chorepiscopus* of the royal city of Khumdan, Singan-fu, son of Millesios, of blessed memory, a priest from Balkh in Tochuristan, erected this tablet of stone, upon which the laws of our Lord, and the instructions of our Fathers have been written down by command of the Emperors of China."

of the monument at the early date claimed for it. The Japanese scholar Takakusu discovered an old Chinese MS. written at the end of the eighth century wherein it is stated that an Indian Buddhist had come to Singan bringing with him a priest of the religion of the Tatsin, and that this priest named Kingtsing wrote an inscription upon a stone in which he set forth the doctrine of Mischiha (the Chinese transcription for the Syrian Mashia or our Messias). Other Chinese writings show traces of a like tradition, as has been indicated by the eminent Sinologian St. Julien, cited by Renan and others as thoroughly trustworthy in such matters.

One of the leading objections, which gave coloring to the distrust with which the monument was for a time received by European scholars, arose from the fact that the patriarch (Nestorian) Hananischo (Ananjeso), whose name is recorded on the side of the monument, died in 778; at least so it is stated by the learned Orientalist and bibliographer Assemani. Under this supposition he could hardly have been mentioned as incumbent of the patriarchal see of Seleucia at the time of the writing of the tablet, which is dated three years later, even if we allow for the long distance between Syria and the Chinese capital. But since Assemani, conclusive evidence has come to light that his date was conjectural, and that Mar Hananischo died in 780, which, considering the difficulty of conveying the message of the patriarch's death from Bagdad to Singan-fu, in less than a few months, sufficiently explains the discrepancy.

THE CHANTING OF THE "CONFITEOR" IN SOLEMN MASS.

The question has been frequently asked whether the Deacon in a solemn Mass should sing, or merely recite, the *Confiteor* which, according to the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*,[1] is to be chanted in Pontifical Masses whenever Holy Communion is given at such functions. The case occurs frequently at the solemn celebration of the Children's First Communion, and also in Solemn Requiem Masses, such as anniversaries celebrated at an early hour when relatives and friends offer Holy Communion for the deceased.

[1] I, c. 9, n. 6 and II, c. 29, n. 3.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites in its answer to the question (November 29, 1902) leaves the Deacon free either to chant or simply to recite the *Confiteor* before the distribution of Holy Communion in ordinary solemn Masses; and suggests that the custom of each locality be preserved. But if Holy Communion is distributed during Solemn Requiem Masses, the *Confiteor* is to be recited (not chanted). The reason of this is that the ordinary rubrics forbid the distribution of Holy Communion in requiem Masses generally. Only when there are special reasons for doing so is an exception to be made. The chanting of the *Confiteor* in Masses for the dead would ordinarily be unliturgical.

PEDAGOGICS IN ECCLESIASTICAL SEMINARIES.

We understand that in one, at least, of our Clerical Seminaries careful attention is being given to the training of candidates for the priesthood in the science and art of teaching. This includes preparation according to fixed methods not only of catechizing and religious instruction, but of regular pedagogy which makes the seminarists conversant with the best systems of our national and parochial schools. By such methods priests are induced and enabled to take intelligent interest in the scholastic management of their parishes, to sustain the teachers and thus to exercise a wholesome influence upon the intellectual development of our youth. This is quite a necessity in view of the demoralizing influence which education, when solely controlled by secular influence, is sure to produce upon our growing generation.

A prominent director of Diocesan Schools has lately suggested that there be a selection made of the best qualified students in the department of theology at our larger seminaries, who might be sent to attend regular lecture courses in schools of pedagogy at neighboring Universities or Normal Institutes. This would give them an insight into the work done at those centres, and familiarize them with the facilities offered under the public system; it would furnish many valuable suggestions, and thus enable priests later on properly to counteract the hurtful effects which are sure to arise from false principles in education, no matter how faultless is the method under which such principles are instilled.

If furthermore the directors of the Parochial School system in different dioceses, having the coöperation of their own local clergy, were to meet occasionally and adopt plans for uniform action, our Catholic educational force, with its devoted bands of Christian Brothers and teaching Sisters, would soon take the lead instead of following the Public School standard and weakening its own efficiency by picking up scraps from the secular field.

Under a uniform system of training in pedagogy among the junior clergy there would be formed a number of able and well equipped school directors ready to take the places of the present corps of educational pioneers, each of whom is apparently obliged to carve his individual way through a wall of difficulties, of prejudices and indifference, which arises mainly from the lack of a rightly schooled appreciation on the part of the clergy and parents.

THE TRAVELLING CLERIC AT PRAYER.

A writer in the Austrian *Theol. Pract. Quartalschrift* (LIII, 3, p. 737) good-humoredly reminds his brother priests that there is a serious side to the habit of reciting the office in a public coach or waiting-room where the man of prayer is, whether he will or not, more or less on exhibition. "I recently saw a young priest," he writes, "in the restaurant of a Southern railway station anxiously reciting his Breviary. He had placed himself at the exit to the trains, where hundreds of people were passing in and out, and where it would necessarily be most difficult to fix one's attention upon anything like prayer or thoughtful reading. Everybody going in or out of the hall could have seen the priest, whose lips were mechanically moving, whilst his eyes wandered from one person to another as they passed before him. No doubt he was intent upon satisfying a duty, and wished to make a clear conscience by literally fulfilling the obligation of reciting the Canonical Hours within the solar day. But what is the impression likely to be produced upon Protestants and infidels by this exhibition of 'prayer,' which has all the qualities of the mere lip-service so flagrantly denounced by our Lord, and surely disgusting to every thinking man of the world. If a priest is bound to the recitation of the Breviary, he is bound also to avoid making the act of

prayer an object of ridicule or disdain. The people who must have noticed this representative of the Church cannot be charged with Pharisaical scandal if they considered his evidently mechanical devotion either blasphemous or despicable." The Apostolic utterance "Blasphematur nomen Dei per vos inter gentes" (Rom. 2 : 24), and the curse lodged upon the servant "who doth the work of the Lord deceitfully" (Jer. 48 : 10), come to the mind of one contemplating a priest who thus places himself in the highway with the twofold intention of praying and keeping his eye upon the busy throng. Our gentle critic rightly suggests that a proper use of the morning hour before starting upon an excursion, or at least a retired corner in the waiting-room, if a suitable place is not likely to be found in the railway coach—where one is less exposed to distraction and to criticism from those who note any accidental lack of devout attention in a priest—is preferable to the method of pulling out the Breviary whenever a few spare minutes seem to lap over from other and less worthy occupation.

MATRIMONY OF STRANGERS.

Qu. May a pastor permit persons to marry in his church who have had no fixed residence, but have wandered, mostly in search of work, from place to place, and finally concluded to settle down? I take the case in which he has no knowledge of their antecedents, and cannot obtain data from any other pastor. Is it sufficient if they take an oath before a priest or a notary public to the effect that neither of the applicants for marriage is married to any other party? Or is it necessary to apply to the Bishop for special faculties?

Resp. The general law of the Church prescribes that persons who are not known to be *vagi*, and as such declared, must identify themselves or declare their freedom under oath before the Bishop, or with his consent before the Vicar-General or the Vicar *Foraneus*. The Holy See frequently gives faculties to the Bishops which enable them to subdelegate this right "ad juramentum suppletorium recipiendum" to other priests (*insignes et idonei*) and to parish priests generally. (*S. R. U. Inqui.*, 8 Aug. 1900.)

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

(Continued.)

Kostlin, Friedrich. Leitfaden zum Unterricht im Neuen Testament für höhere Schulen; Tübingen 1902, J. C. B. Mohr; 8vo, pp. vii—136.

Kohn, Sm. Die Geschichte der Beschneidung bei den Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart; (in Hebrew); Krakau und Frankfurt a.M. 1902; 8vo, pp. vii—230.

Krauss, Sm. Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen, herausgegeben und erläutert; Berlin 1902; 8vo, pp. viii—309.

Kroll, M. Die Beziehungen des klassischen Alterthums zu den hl. Schriften des A. und N. T.; Trier 1901, Paulinus-Druckerei; 8vo, pp. viii—66.

Kuppers, W. Neue Untersuchungen über den Quellenwert der vier Evangelien; Berlin 1902; 8vo, pp. v—123.

Labanca, B. Gesù Cristo nella letteratura contemporanea, straniera ed italiana; Torino 1903; 16mo, pp. 452.

Lagrange, R. P. L'ange de Jahvé; *Revue Biblique*, April, 1903.

Lagrange, Fr. M. J. L'Évangile et l'Église, par Alfred Loisy; in *Revue Biblique*, April, 1903, pp. 292–313.

Lagrange, P. M. J. Le Livre des Juges; Paris 1903; V. Lecoffre.

Lake, Kirsopp. Codex I of the Gospels and its Allies; Texts and Studies vii, 3; Cambridge University Press.

Levi, Israel. L'Ecclésiastique, ou la Sagesse de Jésus, fils de Sira; texte original hébreu édité, traduit et commenté; deuxième partie; Paris 1901; Ernest Leroux; pp. lxx—243.

Lewis, A. S. Apocrypha: The Protevangelium Jacobi and Transitus Mariae; with texts from the Septuagint, the Corân, the Peshitta, etc.; London, 1902; 4to.

Ley, J. Das Buch Hiob nach seinem Inhalt, seiner Kunstgestaltung und religiösen Bedeutung. Für gebildete Leser darge-

stellt. Mit einem Vorwort von E. Kautzsch; Halle 1902; 8vo; pp. v—153.

Lidzbarski, M. Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphie; erster Band; Giessen 1900–1902, Rickersche Verlagsbuchhandlung; 8vo, pp. 372.

Littman, Enno. Abyssinian Apocalypses; in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*, January, 1903.

Lummis, Edward. The Gospel according to St. John: an Inquiry into its Genesis and Historical Value, by Dr. Wendt, translated into English; Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.

Luther, Mt. Erklärung der Eisenacher Perikopen; die evangelischen Perikopen; herausgegeben von G. Mayer; Gütersloh 1903; 8vo, pp. vii—607.

M'Fayden, Prof. John E. Did Elijah cut himself for the Dead? in *The Expository Times*, December, 1902, p. 143.

Machir bar Abbi Mari. Jalkut ha-Machiri. Sammlung Midraschischer Auslegungen der Sprüche Salomons. Zum ersten Male nach einer Handschrift herausgegeben mit Anmerkungen, Quellennachweis und Einleitung versehen von L. Grünhut; (in Hebrew); Frankfurt a.M. 1902; 8vo, pp. 232.

Mackintosh, Rev. H. R. The Objective Aspect of the Lord's Supper; *The Expositor*, March, 1903.

Maymonides. Einleitung in die Misna; Arabischer Text, mit umgearbeiteter hebräischer Übersetzung des Charizi und Anmerkungen, herausgegeben von Ch. Hamburger; Frankfurt a.M. 1902; 8vo, pp. xvii—73.

Martin, W. W. A. Psalmist's Epithalamion; in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, October, 1902.

McKim, R. H. The Gospel in the Christian Year; Longmans, 6s.

Menegoz, Eugen. Die Rechtfertigungslehre nach Paulus und nach Jacobus; Giessen 1903, J. Ricker; 8vo, pp. 36.

Midrash hag-Gadol. Forming a Collection of Ancient Rabbinic Homilies to the Pentateuch; edited by S. Schechter. Genesis; London, 1902; 4to, pp. 464.

Moffat, James. Die urchristlichen Gemeinden: sittengeschichtliche Bilder, von Ernst von Dobschütz; in *The Expository Times*, March, 1903.

Moorhead, W. G. Outline Studies in Acts, Rom. 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Eph.; London, 1902; 8vo, pp. 248.

Moorhead, W. G. Outline Studies in Old Testament Books; London, 1902; 8vo, pp. 364.

Moulton, Dr. J. H. It is his Angel; in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902.

Moynihan, Humphrey. Harnack and His Critics; *The Catholic University Bulletin*, April, 1903.

Müller, Eugen. Der Echte Hiob; Hannover 1902, Fr. Rehtmeyer; 8vo, pp. 40.

Müller, Dr. W. Max. Die Alten Ägypter als Krieger und Eroberer in Asien; in *Der Alte Orient*, v. 1; Leipzig 1903, J. C. Hinrichs.

Murillo, L. Jesucristo y la iglesia romana; estudios critico-biblicos sobre Jesucristo, como fundador de la iglesia y sobre esta en calidad de institución de Jesucristo; parte II: La iglesia romana; Madrid 1902; 4to, pp. 872—689—915.

Murphy, Rev. J. D. Ancient Commerce with East Africa and the "Ophir" of King Solomon; in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, January, 1903.

Nagel, G. F. Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem; nach den Quellen dargestellt; Leipzig 1902. 8vo, pp. viii—124.

Nash, Rev. Dr. J. Explanation and Application of Bible History; New York: Benziger.

Nilles, N., S.J. Zur Frage über die Sängerin des Magnificat; in *Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.*, 1903, II. Heft.

Oenninger, F. Das Leben Jesu; Konstanz 1902; 8vo, pp. xvi—477.

Oliphant, Mrs. John Stewart. The End of the Bible; London, Marshall Brothers.

Perrin, L'Abbé Elie. L'Évangile et le Temps présent; Paris 1901, Retaux; 18mo, pp. vi—380.

Petavel-Olliff, E. Le plan de Dieu dans l'évolution; Lausanne, 1902.

Peters, Dr. Norbert. Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus, untersucht, herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit kritischen Noten versehen; Freiburg 1902, B. Herder; 8vo, pp. xvi—448.

Pick, B. Extra-canonical Life of Christ; London, 1903, 8vo.

Pinches, T. G. The Old Testament. In the Light of the His-

torical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia; 1902; pp. 520.

Prager, L. Das Tausendjährige Reich sowie Christi sichtbare Wiederkunft zum Weltgericht und zur Vollendung des Reiches Gottes; Leipzig 1903; 8vo, pp. vii—96.

Proksch, O. Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche Ueberlieferung bei den vorexilischen Propheten; Leipzig 1902; 8vo, pp. viii—176.

Rahmer, Mr. Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus; durch Vergleichung mit den jüdischen Quellen und ältesten Versionen kritisch beleuchtet; die Commentarii zu den 12 kleinen Propheten. 1. Hälfte; 2 Hefte; Berlin 1902; 8vo, pp. v—vi—47—19—48; iii—60.

Riedel, W. Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen; Leipzig 1902, Deichert; 8vo, pp. 104.

Ritchie, Rev. Arthur. Spiritual Studies in St. Matthew's Gospel; New York, Longmans.

Ritter, Alb. Christus der Erlöser; Linz 1903; 8vo, pp. vii—303.

Rix, Herbert. A Dawning Faith; London, Williams & Norgate; 5s.

Rohling, Dr. Mgr. En Route pour Sion: ou la Grande Espérance d'Israel et de toute l'humanité; traduit de l'allemand par Ernest Rohmer; Paris, Lethielleux; pp. xix—336.

Ropes, James Hardy. An Important New Testament Manuscript; *Biblical World*, February, 1903.

Rothstein, J. W. Die Genealogie des Königs Joachim und seiner Nachkommen in geschichtlicher Beleuchtung; eine kritische Studie zur jüdischen Geschichte und Litteratur; Berlin 1902, 8vo, pp. vii—162.

Roy, Henri. Israel und die Welt in Jesaja 40–55; ein Beitrag zur Ebed-Jahwe-Frage; Leipzig 1903; Friedrich Jansa; 8vo, pp. 69.

Sanday, Prof. W. Criticism of the New Testament: St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902; London, 1902; 8vo, pp. 240.

Sanday, Prof. W. The Virgin Birth; *The Expository Times*, April, 1903.

Savignac, R. P. M. R. Le haut-lieu de Pétra.—Fouilles anglaises; *Revue Biblique*, April, 1903.

Sayce, Rev. A. H. The Hyksos in Egypt; *Biblical World*, May, 1903.

Sayce, Rev. A. H. Discovery of the Tomb of Thothmes IV; *Expository Times*, April, 1903.

Schell, Hermann. Das Evangelium und seine weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung; Christus; vol. iii of "Weltgeschichte in Karakterbildern;" Mainz 1903, Kirchheim; 8vo, pp. 156.

Schlatter, Prof. A. Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten; Gütersloh 1902, C. Bertelsmann; 8vo, pp. 180.

Schmalzl, Rev. Prof. P. Das Buch Ezechiel, erklärt; forming iii, 1 of "Kurzgefasster wissenschaftlicher Commentar"; Wien 1901, Mayer & Co.; 8vo, pp. xi—473.

Schmid, Fr. Der Unsterblichkeits- und Auferstehungsglaube in der Bibel; Brixen 1902; 8vo, pp. v—362.

Schmidtke, Alfr. Die Evangelien eines alten Unzialcodex nach einer Abschrift des 13. Jahrhunderts herausgegeben; Leipzig 1903; 8vo, pp. 40—116.

Schnedermann, Prof. Georg. Der geschichtliche Christus und die christliche Glaubenslehre; Leipzig 1902, Bernhard Richter; 8vo, pp. iv—32.

von Schrenck, Erich. Jesus und seine Predigt; Vorträge für Gebildete; Göttingen 1902, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 8vo, pp. x—234.

Schumacher, Phil. und **Joseph Schlecht.** Das Leben Jesu; München 1902; Allgem. Verlgschft.

Schweiler, Johann Ev. Das Gleichnis in den Büchern des Alten Testaments; München 1903, Schuh; 8vo, pp. 47.

Seissenberger, Prof. Rich. Die Bücher Esdras, Nehemias und Esther, übersetzt und erklärt; forming I, iv, 1 of "Kurzgefasster wissenschaftlicher Commentar;" Wien 1901, Mayer & Co.; 8vo, pp. xx—210.

Seyring, F. Die alt-israelitische Religion in den "Heldengeschichten" des Richterbuchs; Hamburg 1902; 8vo, pp. ii—30.

Shaw, Rev. B. D. The Pauline Epistles, London, 1903; 8vo, pp. 520.

Sickenberger, Dr. Jos. Die Lukaskatene des Niketas von Heraklea, untersucht; N. F. vii, 4 of "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Gesch. d. altchristl. Litteratur."

Siegfried, Prof. D. C. Esra, Nehemia und Esther, übersetzt und erklärt; forming I, vi, 2 of "Handkommentar zum A. T."; Göttingen 1901, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 8vo, pp. iv—175.

Simon, Thdr. Der Logos. Ein Versuch erneuter Würdigung einer alten Wahrheit; Leipzig 1902; 8vo, pp. v—132.

Smith, David. Our Lord's Use of Proverbs; *Expositor*, December, 1902.

Smith, Prof. G. A. Studies in the History and Topography of Jerusalem: A General View of the City; *The Expositor*, January, The Name Jerusalem and other Names, *The Expositor*, February, 1903.

Smith, J. Integrity of Scripture: Plain Reasons for Rejecting the Critical Hypothesis; London, 1902; 8vo, pp. 292.

Socin, Albert. Diwan aus Centralarabien; gesammelt, übersetzt und erläutert; herausgegeben von Hans Stumme; iii Theile; Leipzig 1900–1901; pp. iv—300; iv—146; x—354.

von Soden, Herman Freiherr. Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte; Bd. i, 1; Berlin 1902, Al. Duncker; pp. xvi—704.

Spitta, Friedrich. Untersuchungen über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer; Göttingen 1901; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 8vo, pp. 193.

Stave, Prof. Erik. Der Einfluss der Bibelkritik auf das christliche Glaubensleben; Tübingen 1903; J. C. B. Mohr; 8vo, pp. 52.

Stewart, Rev. G. W. Wendt on the Fourth Gospel; *The Expositor*, February, 1903.

Stöckhardt, G. Commentar über den Propheten Jesaia; St. Louis, 1902; 8vo, pp. xvi—168.

Strachan, J. Hebrew Ideals. From the Story of the Patriarchs; Part I; Edinburgh, 1902; pp. 204.

Swete, Prof. H. B. The Teaching of Christ; *Expositor*, February and April, 1903.

Swete, Prof. H. B. The Two Greatest Miracles; *Expository Times*, February, 1903; pp. 214

Swete, Prof. H. B. Mat. xxviii, 16–20; *Expositor*, October, 1902.

Swete, Prof. H. B. The Gospel according to St. Mark; Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices; London, 1902; 8vo, pp. 554.

Talmud, der babylonische. Herausgegeben nach der "editio princeps," nebst Varianten der späteren von S. Lorja und J. Berlin revidirten Ausgaben und der Münchener Handschrift möglichst wortgetreu übersetzt und mit kurzen Erklärungen versehen von L. Goldschmidt; vii. Bd. Civil- und Strafrecht; 4 Lfrng.; der Traktat Sebuôth; Berlin 1903; 4to, pp. 611—791.

Taylor, John. A Nestorian Commentary on the Old Testament; *Expository Times*, October, 1902.

Temple Bible. The last five volumes published are: Joshua and Judges, by Prof. Kennedy; Job and Ruth, by W. E. Addis; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, by Prof. Margoliouth; the Later Pauline Epistles, by Bishop Moule; an Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures, by Bishop Boyd Carpenter; Dent; Lippincott, Phila., 1s. each.

Van Hoonacker, M. A. Une question touchant la composition du livre du Job; *Revue biblique*, April, 1903.

Walther, Ernst. Bibelwort und Bibelwissenschaft mit besonderer Beziehung auf den evangelischen Religionsunterricht; Berlin 1903; Mittler & Sohn; 8vo, pp. iv—108.

Watson, Dr. John. The Life of the Master; London, Hodder and Stoughton.

Weiss, Prof. B. Das Neue Testament; Handausgabe. Leipzig 1902, Hinrichs; 3 vols.

Weiss, Johs. Das älteste Evangelium; ein Beitrag zum Verständniss des Markus-Evangeliums und der ältesten evangelischen Überlieferung; Göttingen 1903; 8vo, pp. viii—414.

Weizsäcker, Carl. Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen und den Gang ihrer Entwicklung; zweite Aufl.; Williams & Norgate; 7s.

White, Rev. N. J. D. The Virgin-Birth; *Expositor*, March, 1903.

Wiernikowski, I. Das Buch Hiob nach der Auffassung der rabbinischen Litteratur in den ersten fünf nachchristlichen Jahrhunderten, I. Tl.; Breslau 1902; 8vo, pp. iii—92.

Witz-Oberlin, C. A. Jesus Christus nach dem Evangelium Johannis; Berlin 1902, C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn; 8vo, pp. iv—238.

Wurm, Dr. Alois. Die Irrlehrer im ersten Johannesbrief; viii. 1 of "Biblische Studien;" Freiburg 1903; B. Herder; pp. xii—160.

Zahn, Prof. Theodor. Athanasius und der Bibelkanon; Leipzig 1901, Deichert; 8vo, pp. 36.

Ziegler, Ign. Die Königsgleichnisse des Midrasch beleuchtet durch die römische Kaiserzeit; Breslau 1903; 8vo, pp. xxxii—456—cxcii.

Ziegler, K. W. Die Versöhnung mit Gott; Bekenntnisse und Erkenntniswege; Tübingen 1902; J. G. B. Mohr; 8vo, pp. vii—441.

Zscharnack, Leopold. Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten Jahrhunderten der christlichen Kirche; Göttingen 1902; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 8vo, pp. viii—192.

Criticisms and Notes.

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN CIVILIZATION. Being some Chapters in European History. By William Samuel Lilly, Hon. Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge. London: Chapman and Hall. 1903. Pp. xx—374.

Without being very original, deep, or brilliant, Mr. Lilly contrives to say much that is thoughtful and suggestive on the philosophy of European history, regarded from a Catholic viewpoint. The bulk of his work appeared in a book published in 1886, now out of print, under the title of *Chapters in European History*. It has now been rewritten and considerably augmented. To this are added three articles, from the London *Nineteenth Century*, with various alterations, and a chapter on "The Age of the Martyrs," practically new. The additions are carefully made, with the result that otherwise disconnected chapters are woven into a literary unity. In a luminous introduction we are given the key to the purpose of the book. Admitting the evolutionary theory as regards man's unceasing striving after perfection, culminating in religious experience, Mr. Lilly will have none of the crude materialism that reduces the highest ethical impulses to movements of protoplasm as their primary source and regards the human species as differing only in degree from the reptile or the lowly polyps. The true term of evolutionary progress is spiritual and moral. The indubitable facts of psychical experience—truth, love, righteousness—are outside the ken of pure materialism. "When we say supreme truth, supreme love, supreme righteousness, we say God."

These ideals of the developed soul find their realization in Christianity, with its basal doctrine of the Incarnation whereby God enters into personal relations with His creatures. Thus the clue to the complex history of Christianity in the world lies in the religious philosophy with which it combated the rude weapons of Imperial Paganism, and, later, preserved its integrity when hydra-headed heresy threatened its very life. Mr. Lilly investigates the origins of Catholicism, tracing with singular clearness its slow development from a persecuted sect hiding itself in the catacombs from the light of day, through the period when it was patronized by emperors, up to the proud day when it sat as a queen above the nations of the earth,

deposing monarchs from their thrones, invoking the aid of the civil power to do its behests. He is particularly happy in the chapter entitled "The Turning-point of the Middle Ages," in sketching the reconstruction of modern Europe and the long-drawn battle between feudalism and Catholicism ending in the victory of Gregory VII (Hildebrand), who, in fighting for the Supremacy of Peter, was in reality maintaining the great principle of spiritual equality among those who were baptized fellow members of the One Body of Christ. That was the death-blow to the feudal system that seemed at one time to be about to vanquish the ecclesiastical polity. He lays himself open, however, in the same chapter to some hostile criticism, when he attributes freedom of worship and even of the press to the same great Pontiff, and he would have done better to have forestalled similar animadversions against his further statement that the Deposing Power, brought into requisition so unsparingly by Gregory VIII, was "the principal and most efficacious check upon monarchical violence and oppression," by giving historical illustrations in corroboration of its truth.

In another place, the author goes into the opposite extreme of painting the sins of the Papacy in the darkest colors. No Protestant historian could well have used stronger language than the following, in describing the scandals of the Roman Curia in the later Middle Ages: "Against a Stephen VII, guilty of the brutal indecency of dragging the dead body of his predecessor through the streets, may be set such a holy and humble man of heart as Leo VII. . . . Violence and impurity [he has just addressed John XII as guilty of "incest with his relatives and two sisters"] were not the only scandals which disgraced the Chair of Peter.

"Simony was no less conspicuous; and it passed into a proverb that everything in Rome had its price . . . . John XIX, who had himself, when a mere layman, purchased the Popedom upon the death of Benedict VIII, offered to confer the title of Universal Bishop upon the Patriarch of Constantinople for a pecuniary consideration. His successor, Benedict IX, who is stated to have been ordained at the age of twelve, after a career of which, according to the chronicles, the chief incidents were 'many vile adulteries and murders perpetrated by his own hands,' resolved to wed his first cousin, and finding that public opinion would not tolerate a married Pontiff, sold the Papacy to John Gratian."

This wholesale condemnation of Papal corruption should make the Protestant reader prepared to receive with more favor than is usually

the case the defence (somewhat disguised, it is true), of the Inquisition, to which a whole chapter is devoted. Mr. Lilly, while defending the importation of the secular arm to preserve the purity of faith as necessary for the times, with its correlative that the principle of religious toleration would have been altogether premature in the Middle Ages, admits that its day is past and that the repression of freedom in belief would only result in "the intellectual torpor in which the Inquisition left Spain and Italy." He dwells deservedly on the "mildness and benignity" of the action of the Holy Office in suppressing heresy (p. 320); but he would have strengthened his case had he laid stress on the real principle that underlay the denial of toleration in religious matters—the pestilential nature of heresy as affecting the health of the body politic, and needing stern measures of repression, every whit as truly as disease in the human organism calls for the surgeon's knife if the other members are not to suffer.

The chapter on "Holy Matrimony" is also calculated to excite attention. The author's statement that "the proclamation of the spiritual equality of woman with man in the new order . . . brought about what may well appear the most wonderful part of the great change due to the influence of Christianity," will commend itself to the Catholic and non-Catholic reader alike, and his elaborate justification of the Church's unchanging defence of the indissolubility of the marriage bond as the one safeguard of the sanctity of family life, no less essential to the well-being of the State than the best interests of religion, would alone make the book worth possessing.

This chapter should be read in connection with an earlier one where the age of St. Augustine is outlined in some eloquent periods, and, in particular, the teaching of the great Doctor of the West on marriage and celibacy—the foundation of subsequent ecclesiastical legislation—is luminously dealt with.

Remaining chapters treat of "The Nascent Church," "The Age of the Martyrs," and "The Age of Faith," the last-named concerned with the growth of Western monasticism. They are marked by the thoughtfulness, argumentative power, clearness, and forcefulness of expression, that one looks for in work by Mr. Lilly. There are some clever controversial hits, *e. g.*, the reference to "a Church which is a mere multitude of individuals, for everyone of whom his own private judgment or inclination is the ultimate arbiter of faith and morals;" and independence of traditional belief is shown in a passage where the author agrees with Monsignor Duchesne in thinking

that "the twenty-five years of the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter come into contact with rather serious difficulties." "No doubt," he says, "the tradition usually followed by Catholic writers, that St. Peter arrived in [Rome] in the year 42, is ancient . . . But there is a strong case against it." And he proceeds to adduce the date of Herod Agrippa's persecution (A. D. 44), and the silence concerning St. Peter in the Epistle to the Romans (written, he considers, in A. D. 58), in support of his contention. Other statements open to criticism are—(1) that the assemblies of the early Church had "more in common with the modern Catholic Confraternity and the modern Methodist Class Meeting . . . than with the modern Church," (p. 82); (2) that in the first centuries of the Christian era "a weekly celebration had now taken the place of the daily celebration of the first Church in Jerusalem, *and it was held in the evening.*" Surely a confusion is made in the concluding part of the sentence with the Agapé or Love-feast.

We also notice a misquotation of Matthew Arnold's poem, "The Future," on page 296. In spite of such minor defects the book deserves attention for its studiously philosophical outlook on history in its relation to the development of Catholic organization, doctrine, and discipline. It ranks among the best that Mr. Lilly has yet given us.

MEMOIRS OF FRANCIS KERRIL AMHERST, D.D., Lord Bishop of Northampton. By Dame Mary Francis Roskell, O.S.B. Edited by Henry F. J. Vaughan, B.A., S.C.L., Oxon. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. MDCCCCIII. Pp. 403.

The Life of Dr. Amherst, which is in large measure a portrait drawn by himself with that most faithful of pencils, the unconscious language of his own letters, makes interesting reading, not only because the Bishop possessed many fascinating traits of character, but also because his career lights up certain phases of public life in which he had a share. We get to know something of other men and women about whom the reader of contemporary history is curious, and with whom the Bishop of Northampton came in close contact.

He had a bright and genial disposition, which was supported by deep religious convictions on the one hand, and on the other by natural refinement and a broad culture. From his parents he inherited both Saxon and Breton blood, and the best Catholic traditions ex-

pressed in the words "piety, purity, patience," which seem to have been a parole of the family.

Born in London on March 21, 1819, he grew up amid the associations which a refined home and the culture of a large metropolis bear with them. Besides this he had early opportunities of travelling on the Continent and enriching his youthful mind with a thousand impressions of nature and art that lent themselves to practical uses in later life. What sort of religious influences he received from his parents may be surmised from a letter which his father wrote to him and his younger brother at a time when several other members of the family were ill in the city with fever, which resulted in the death of two of the little ones at home. The father writes:

MY DEAREST BOYS:

Under the very severe affliction in which we are, I can hardly write to you; but I think it right to entreat you both to pray with all the devotion you are able for God's protection and recovery of your two little dear sisters, Alethea and Anny, who are both ill; the former is in great danger. Every time you go to the chapel do not forget, for my sake and your poor mother's, to implore the Almighty to spare their lives; at the same time that His holy will may be done. Pray for us also, that we may be enabled to bear these most severe trials as we ought. Your three eldest sisters are sent to lodgings in George Street to avoid infection, and therefore you should also implore the God of Heaven, who alone can protect and preserve them to us, to keep them safe from the disease.

As you are now our only sons, I wish to impress upon your minds the necessity of being truly devout and good, that you may become the comfort and support of our declining years.

May God bless you both and preserve you. Be united and affectionate to each other. Your mother also gives you her blessing. Take care of your health.

Your most affectionate father,

WILLIAM K. AMHERST.

Later on at the age of eleven Francis was sent to Oscott, where he found himself very happy, "liking the masters and the boys and not being averse to study." That was in the old days when the college was at Maryvale, and "the president appeared in top boots, leather breeches, with an Oxford master's gown and cap." Here he remained eight years, and the records of this period, kept in a diary, are very interesting.

On leaving the college in 1838 he proposed to take up the study of engineering, for he had not yet determined to follow the clerical vocation, though there seems to have been a premonition in his heart of hearts that it was his ultimate duty to leave the world and labor in

behalf of the conversion of England. For two years he stayed in Belgium studying the civil sciences; and it was here, apparently through the instrumentality of an humble and pious maid-servant in the house of the Bodenham family, where he boarded, that his thoughts were directed into a higher channel. Margaret Hallahan (Peggy, as she was then called), about whose simple piety Francis Amherst had frequently written to his mother as being the mark of some great grace, afterwards became a nun of the Third Order of St. Dominic, and went to England where she introduced the Institute, thus becoming the means of saving innumerable souls. In 1840 Francis Amherst had made up his mind to study for the Church. For this purpose he returned, in the following year, to Oscott where Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman was at the time president. "I am getting on very well in theology," he writes to his mother, later; "I never studied anything so interesting, and have two excellent professors and a capital library." In 1842 he accompanied Dr. Wiseman on his way to Rome. His notes of this journey are full of spice and keen observations on men and things.

He returned to Oscott intending to consult the Bishop of Birmingham about embracing the religious life; but found Dr. Ullathorne in prison. The Bishop had been made responsible and sued for debts belonging to another person and of which he had not the slightest intimation; and the appeal for redress had to take the course of law. Francis Amherst had in the meantime determined to enter the Order of Friar Preachers. Lacordaire was reviving the Dominican Order in France. Fr. Jandel was restoring the ancient discipline of the Friars in Rome. The spirit of St. Dominic with its severe life had a special charm for youths of a courageous and self-sacrificing temper, and in 1853 we find young Amherst on his way to Woodchester to enter the novitiate there. Father Tom Burke, the great preacher, was master of novices at the time. The event proved that Francis was not called to this life, for his health grew steadily bad under the new régime, and he was obliged to leave the following year. He returned to Oscott where he remained for some time as professor. Subsequently Bishop Ullathorne appointed him to a mission in Stafford. Here Fr. Amherst became the model of a zealous and devoted pastor. "He made his daily round of visits to the sick, the gaol, the workhouse, etc.," bringing consolation to the afflicted and gaining their affection. Like most parish priests with a soul for music, the Rev. Francis Amherst had his trials with his choir. Perhaps he was somewhat

over-fastidious in his demands upon vocal culture. "Last night there were children singing hymns," he writes in his diary under *November 1st*, "which they call 'All Hollering' (All Hallow e'en), one of the hymns ends, 'God grant rest to their souls.'"

In 1858, on May the 4th, he received a telegram from Mgr. George Talbot, then in Rome, which read: *Vous êtes nommé évêque de Northampton.* "My first impulse was to go instantly to Rome to beg the Holy Father to reverse the decision." He sent a telegram in reply: *Si fieri potest transeat a me calix iste.* The operator so transformed the despatch that Mgr. Talbot could not make out what it meant. Being taken to Pope Pius, who was equally incapable of reading it, it merely elicited from the Pontiff the remark: "It does not matter; it no doubt means that he does not want to be a bishop."

On July 4, 1858, he was consecrated at Oscott by Cardinal Wiseman, and Bishops Ullathorne and Vaughan of Plymouth. The biographer says, "Much of Francis Amherst's earthly happiness ceased with his accession to a mitre, but he did his duty nobly and generously. The prospect of the diocese was not encouraging, and unless on visitations, the Bishop lived like a solitary amidst his poor and scattered flock. The following from a letter to one of his sisters, a Benedictine nun (another sister who had joined the Order of Providence had died shortly before), gives some idea of his position at Northampton, and at the same time of his sense of humor, as he reminds her that he is living in a town which is the industrial centre of the shoemaking trade.

"I shall be delighted to see Mr. MacDonell if he will take us as we are, isolated from the world. I feel rather like Simon Stylites, without his sanctity, in my little room here, but am very happy. . . . Even *we look down* upon the staple of Northampton commerce and irreverently *tread it under foot.* The professors of the *heeling* art are not all doctors here, and whatever may be said of the Northamptonians they remain true to the *last*, and the main body of the people is engaged in looking after the *soles* of others and their own to *boot.*

"What would you think of such a notice as this stuck up in a window: 'Ten good strong stabbing girls and a Prince of Wales finisher wanted'; or this: 'Wanted, four black hands, several skivers, clickers, and a rough-stuff-man'; or again: 'A good blocking-boy and Singer's hand may apply?' Such announcements are enough to frighten anyone who does not think that 'there is nothing like leather.'"

In 1869 he went in company with Dr. Errington (Bishop of Trebizond) and Dr. Clifford (of Clifton) to attend the Vatican Council. The account given in his letters of the ceremonies, the different

meetings and personalities, are charmingly entertaining. He notes the sublime and the ridiculous without any apparent change of feeling. The intense heat of Rome obliged him to leave while the Council was still in sitting. He went north, tarrying for a while in Switzerland, where he witnessed the Passion Play at Oberammergau. He has left some verses in which he gives us his impressions of that journey; these end with a reference to the play:

> And once in later days the bitter scene
> Of Christ's dear Passion we beheld portrayed,
> With voice and music sad, and reverent mien,
> By rural artisan and village maid,
> So that we wept, all wept. Could this have been,
> If from the faith that noble race had strayed?

On June 4, 1871, Dr. Amherst lost his mother. What she had been to her children may be gleaned from the record of her virtues made by those who had known her. "I do not think," says a Benedictine Father of Coventry, "I ever met anyone who more completely gave me the idea of loving God above all things and their neighbors as themselves." At her death she left a letter for each of her children to be opened after she had departed, in which she begged their forgiveness for all the *bad example* she had given them during her life, and to entreat them "never to forget to pray for her poor soul." She was buried in a church which she had built out of her private income.

The Bishop's brother, Father William Amherst, of the Society of Jesus, had been doing mission work and was greatly instrumental, as we are told, in removing from the people "all idea of difference between regular and secular as to the one great aim of missionary work." There was a general report abroad that Father William was to be made Bishop. Anent this his brother the Bishop writes to him: "I heard again that you were on the list for one of the new hierarchy. All the advice I can give you is what Punch gave to persons about to marry: 'Don't,' if you can help it and if it depends on you. You would make a capital bishop, but must be prepared to say good-by to peace and quiet of mind for the rest of your life if you get a Scotch mitre."

In the summer of 1877 he repairs to Oscott, for the election of a new president. He tells how there in the afternoon he played a game of billiards with the boys at their table, and saw several games. "Was extremely pleased by the manner and conduct of the boys—

quiet, gentlemanlike, neither forward nor shy, nor showing off—true Oscotians, whom I cannot help contrasting favorably, *very* favorably, with boys of other colleges."

In 1878 he began to show signs of permanent illness. He was anxious to resign his charge and wrote to that effect to Rome. In September of that year his petition was answered, and he felt relieved of the care of his diocese. Dr. Arthur Riddle was appointed his successor. His illness grew worse each day. "My head is very painful generally," he writes on November 14th, "and I am never a moment without pain. *Fiat Voluntas Dei.*" He had visited Knock in Ireland where, trusting to the report that Our Blessed Lady had appeared, he hoped to gain relief. His impressions of the place and of the persons connected with it were rather favorable, though he himself received no direct evidence there of anything miraculous. Some one spoke to him of the "Nun of Kenmare;" hut he did not conceive a very good opinion of her. "The Nun of Kenmare, one Miss Cusack, seems to occupy her time in writing political letters, etc., which do not come well from the cell of a 'Poor Clare.' I do not like it, and it appears to me that such religious bring discredit on the state."

Toward the end of 1882 he lost his sight, which was a severe trial, for he loved the sight of nature and was also fond of reading. After that he made up his mind that the only favor he had to look for from Heaven was the grace of a happy death. On August 21st of the following year, his soul, fortified by the Sacraments of the Church, was taken into the presence of Almighty God. R.I.P. He was buried in Northampton Cathedral, though once he had expressed a desire to be placed in a public cemetery beside the poor who are taken from the work-house of Northampton. One of his last wishes was that there be no funeral sermon for him.

Such are the outlines of this modern English Bishop's life. We are sure the volume will be read with pleasure and edification by all who cherish priestly virtue and those natural qualities of manly grace and cordiality that attract us as expressions of God's beautiful likeness.

DISPUTATIONES THEOLOGICAE seu Commentaria in Summam Theologicam D. Thomae. De Sacramentis (Pars II) necnon de Novissimis, auctore Aloisio Paquet, S.T.D. Quebeci: S. A. Demero; Neo-Eboraci: Benziger Bros.; Romae: Pustet. 1903. Pp. 572.

With the present volume Dr. Paquet completes his commentary on the *Summa*. The five preceding volumes treated respectively of the

Divine Unity and Trinity, Creation, Redemption, the Incarnation, and the first three Sacraments. The volume at hand is devoted to the theology of the Sacraments of Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony, and the Four Last Things.

For the benefit of those not already acquainted with the work, suffice it here to indicate its general characteristics. The *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas furnishes the substance of the teaching and its ground-plan, except that the *Quaestiones* are organized under the *Disputationes* into which the total matter is divided. The author's special skill is manifest in the development of the *Articles*. These are introduced by observations which explain the state of the individual question—its meaning, bearings, and subdivisions. The body of the article is thus subsumed under one or more conclusions or propositions, each of which is proved in strict form from the usual *fontes theologici*. The objections which follow are also cast in syllogistic mould and answered in the precise formulæ of the schools. The work is therefore the *Summa Theologica ad hodiernos usus et modos accommodata*. No greater praise could be accorded it than this. It contains the solidity of doctrine and reflects the perfect method and translucency of style of that immortal masterpiece, and at the same time supplements its scholastic material with the elements of positive theology demanded by the later development of its general subject; whilst it presents the whole in a shape that is more familiar and is perhaps better adapted to modern usage and requirements. It is significative of the merit of the work that it has been warmly welcomed not only in Canada, for the education of whose clergy it was immediately intended, but likewise in the principal theological centres of Europe, to such an extent indeed that a second edition has been demanded before the completion of the first.

We wish Dr. Paquet could see his way to preparing a treatise *De Vera Religione* on the same plan—not that there is any dearth of excellent books on this subject, but that the present work might lack nothing to make it a complete synthesis of theology for use in the ecclesiastical seminary.

As a commentary on the *Summa* it is hard to see how it could be improved. In so far, too, it is an unsurpassed text-book. With the supplemental volume suggested it would be ideally complete.

Literary Chat.

The Rev. Dr. Casacca publishes a second pamphlet, "De Carentia Ovariorum relate ad Matrimonium." Its main object apparently is to show that a decision of the Roman Dataria in a certain case of affinity calls for a dispensation "nisi praesumptio cedere debeat certae veritati, si mulier ex. gr. perfecte careat utero et ovariis. Semen enim tunc, seu ovulum ad generationem physiologice requisitum ex parte feminae omnino, et consequenter copula tunc non est amplius copula *per se sufficiens ad generationem.*" This decision is equivalent to a statement that the "carentia ovariorum est impotentia," which fact, according to PP. Antonelli and Bucceroni, makes this "carentia" a diriment impediment. There is still, of course, the other side of the argument, maintained by PP. Eschbach and Lehmkuhl, resting likewise upon the authority of the Roman Congregation. It is not necessary to assume that we have here a contradictory decision from the Holy See, for, as we pointed out on a former occasion, the S. Congregation determines its decisions upon the reasons which appear in each case as it is proposed for solution. So far, then, the conclusion that the "carentia" in question constitutes an *impedimentum dirimens matrimonium* is not warranted except in special cases where the S. Congregation so decides on account of the attending circumstances. It lies, of course, as we repeatedly stated, within the competence of the Holy See to establish a "diriment impediment" covering all such cases. But to force that decision as already existing appears both premature and—with all due reverence to the wise heads that defend such a course—not practically desirable, for reasons already given by us.

As for the animus of the pamphlet and the motives that prompted its peculiar form of expression in English footnotes, few readers will probably fail to discern it. The author seems to have a bitter grudge against the editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, in whose attitude toward the question he discerns all kinds of sinister motives, and, lest the reader be in any doubt as to *who* this ignorant and prevaricating editor is, in *four* pages of footnotes, Father Heuser's name is repeated *thirty-one* times, and his supposed errors are scored with emphasis by the constant use of a triple exclamation mark (! ! !).

Scriptores Ecclesiastici de Musica Sacra, printed in 1784 in three folio volumes by the Benedictine Fathers of the monastery of St. Blasius (Black Forest), and of which only rare copies could be obtained at high prices during the last few years, is to be republished (U. Moser, Graz, Austria). The work contains copies of numerous Italian, French, and German musical manuscripts not otherwise accessible.

The University of Chicago is publishing a series of really valuable studies in theology. Some of these appear under the title of *Decennial Publications* and include such themes as "Elements of Chrysostom's Power as a Preacher," by Professor G. Anderson, "Practical Theology," by Gerald Birney Smith. Others are separately issued as part of a series of *Linguistic and Exegetical Studies.* Although these publications do not always tend to confirm Catholic tradition supporting the

deposit of Faith, they furnish carefully collected critical material which the right-minded student of theology will know how to use and profit by. One such work before us is Dr. Allan Hoben's study entitled "The Virgin Birth" of Christ.

The Fifth Annual Record of *The League of St. Columba* (St. Patrick's College, Maynooth), shows that there are splendid elements at work in Ireland for the elevation and promotion of ecclesiastical studies. The League is a collegiate union. Its object is to foster in the students a due appreciation of the value (in the cause of religion) of the literary and historical treasures which illustrate the past life of the nation and thus to perpetuate among ecclesiastics a spirit of religious and Catholic nationality. The members are thereby encouraged to discuss and write upon topics of Irish hagiology, archæology, social manners and customs.

Among the different national writers of contemporary history as well as of fiction whose works will presumably be regarded some day as representative literature of our day, many appear to have been attracted by the unique personality of Leo XIII. The literary editor of the *New York Times* singles out, among other expressions of a classical nature, Mrs. Humphry Ward's picture (in *Eleanor*) of the aged and feeble Pontiff attending Mass in St. Peter's, and the effect of his presence on the crowd; and Paul Bourget's beautiful portrait, in which the writer of *Cosmopolis* contrasts with tender pathos the great High-Priest and Vicar of Christ on earth with the gentle and frail figure of the white-robed old man as he is carried through St. Peter's in the *sedia gestatoria*. But as a character sketch, original in form and rich in true coloring, few pictures of the venerable Pontiff seem to us more charmingly suggestive of the personal attraction which the great Pope exercised upon his immediate surroundings than that given by Mr. James Creelman in his volume *On the Great Highway*. (Lothrop Publishing Co., Boston.) He gives there his impressions of notable figures with whom his position as representative of an influential journal brought him into personal contact, including Tolstoy, Kossuth, King George of Greece, Li Hsi, king of Korea, and other equally well-known figures in the recent history of America, Europe, and Asia. The leading chapter is entitled "The White Shepherd of Rome." We should like to reprint it all here, but want of space forbids it. "As we retired we looked back at the slender white figure standing alone in the shadowy room—and I knew that I had been face to face with the most exalted personality of modern history. Of all the famous men I have met in my world-wanderings since that day—statesmen, monarchs, philosophers, philanthropists—I have seen no other man who seemed to have such a universal point of view."

At the recent Maynooth Union some very important topics of public Catholic activity were discussed. Among these we note Dr. P. A. Sheehan's plea for Higher Seminary Education in connection with the scheme of the proposed Dublin University. Another subject exhaustively dealt with was the establishment of Diocesan Libraries for the separate use of the local clergy. We hope to bring this theme before our readers at an early date, to show what signal advantages would accrue to priests engaged in missionary work, by placing at their disposition the best books in all branches of knowledge.

We quite sympathize with Miss Devereux Blake, who, in *Harper's Weekly*, pleads for the abolition of "the huge institutions that are like enormous educational mills" and which "should give place to smaller and more home-like school communities." The modern tendency is to elevate the common school to the level of a university where children learn by a sort of lecture system, with periodical recitations to test their power of attention. Good results are possible under such a system, but they only affect the mental growth and cannot benefit the development of character. In other words, the system of large classes may facilitate instruction; it does not educate. In order to do the latter the teacher must reach the pupil individually and elicit a personal love prompting respect, obedience, and imitation.

Brown and Nolan, of Dublin, are to bring out a beautifully illustrated *History of Irish Music* by Mr. Grattan-Flood, who has devoted himself to researches in this field for the last twenty-five years.

Sick Calls, or Chapters of Pastoral Medicine, by the Rev. A. M. Mulligan (Birmingham), is the title of a handsomely printed manual for priests to be issued immediately by Benziger Brothers. It deals mainly with priestly ministration in emergency cases and diseases accompanied by delirium or coma, and fulfils an important function in an ecclesiastical library.

The necessity of dealing in a fundamental and popular way with the various social problems which demand practical solution in the interests of public morality and civil safety, has been emphasized by the united episcopate of different countries, especially Belgium and Germany. The Encyclicals of Leo XIII on the subject have served as an index and a norm for Catholic writers and apologists. But there is still need of a treatise embodying a simple and clear exposition of the facts and dangers, as well as of the principles involved and the remedies to be applied, which the clergy and teachers might utilize in preparing instructions for our people on the subject. It would be a magnificent thing if the Catholic University could furnish the material by which this need is to be supplied, and if a way were found to place such an exposition in the hands of every parish priest, with the intimation that it be made the subject of a series of popular discourses. Something of this kind was done by the Archbishop of Philadelphia at the time when the Labor strikes in Pennsylvania were under discussion for settlement. Every priest in the diocese received a pamphlet dealing with the problem from the religio-social point of view without any suggestion of political interference. Many priests made the matter the subject of their sermons, and where this was done in a temperate and impersonal way it must have exercised its influence for peace and public order.

Books Received.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

INTRODUCTIO AD SACRAM THEOLOGIAM seu De Veritate Catholicae Fidei auctore Fr. Joanne Lottini Ordinis Praedicatorum. Paris (VIe). P. Lethielleux, Libraire, Éditeur. 10, Rue Cassette, 10. 1903. Pp. viii—835. Prix, 7 frs.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICAE SPECIALIS, ex Summa Theologica S. Thomae Aquinatis desumptae et Hodiernis Scholis Accommodatae, auctore P. Fr. Joanne Lottini, O. P. Vol. I, De Deo in se considerato et ut principium et finis rerum. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1903. Pp. 560. Prix, 6 frs.

DER TAUFRITUS IN DER GRIECHISCH-RUSSISCHEN KIRCHE, sein Apostolischer Ursprung und seine Entwickelung. Von Dom Antonius Staerk, O.S.B. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. 1903. Zweigniederlassungen in Wien, Strassburg, München und St. Louis, Mo. Pp. xv—194.

DAS APOSTOLISCHE SPEISEGESETZ in den ersten fünf Jahrhunderten. Ein Beitrag zum Verständniss der quasi-levitischen Satzungen in älteren kirchlichen Rechtsquellen, von Dr. Karl Böckenhoff, Privatdozent an der Universität Münster. Mit kirchlicher Druckerlaubniss. Paderborn. Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh. 1903. Pp. vii—142. Price, 4 Marks.

DIE HEILSNOTWENDIGKEIT DER KIRCHE nach der altchristlichen Litteratur, bis zur Zeit des hl. Augustinus. Dargestellt von Dr. theol. et. phil. Anton Seitz, Assistent im Klerikalseminar und Privatdozent an der Universität Würzburg. Mit Approbation des hochw. Herrn Erzbischofs von Freiburg. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. 1903. Zweigniederlassungen in Wien, Strassburg, München und St. Louis, Mo. Pp. viii—416.

LES INDULGENCES. Leur Origine, Leur Nature, Leur Développement. Par le R. P. Alexis—M. Lépicier de l'Ordre des Servites de Marie. Traduit de l'Italien, sous le Contrôle de l'Auteur. Seule édition française autorisée. Publiée avec l'Imprimatur du Maître du Sacré Palais. Tome Deuxième. Paris: P. Lethielleux, Libraire, Editeur. 10, Rue Cassette. Pp. 306.

POLEMICA DE SS. EUCHARISTIAE SACRAMENTO INTER BARTHOLOMAEUM ARNOLDI DE USINGEN, O.E.S.A., ejusque olim in Universitate Erphurdiana Discipulum Martinum Lutherum anno 1530. Manuscripto "De Sacramentis Ecclesiae" extracta ac introductione variisque commentariis necnon imagine illustrata a Dominico Fr. X. P. Duijnstee, ord. erem. St. Aug. Wirceburgi. Sumptibus et Typis Stahelii Aulae regiae et Universitatis Editoris MCMIII. Stahel'sche Verlags-Anstalt in Würzburg. Königlicher Hof- und Universitäts Verlag. Oscar Stahel. 1903. Pp. viii—98. Pr. 2 mark, 50 pfn.

ON THE PRIESTHOOD. A Treatise in Six Books. By Saint John Chrysostom. Translated by the Rev. Patrick Boyle, C.M. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. xxiv—145. Price, $0.85 *net.*

LES SACREMENTS DE L'ÉGLISE CATHOLIQUE. Exposés Dogmatiquement a l'Usage des Prêtres dans le Ministère. Par le Dr. Nicolaus Gihr, Vice-Recteur de l'Université de Fribourg-en-Brisgau. Traduit de l'Allemand par l'Abbé Ph. Mazoyer, du Clergé de Paris. Tome Deuxième: Les Sacrements en Particulier, l'Eucharistie; Tome Troisième: Les Sacrements en Particulier, La Pénitence; Tome Quatrième: Les Sacrements en Particulier, l'Extrême Onction, l'Ordre, le Mariage. Paris: P. Lethielleux. Pp. 380—318—348. Prix: Un volume, 5 fr.; Quatre volumes en 8° carré, brochés 20 fr. Chaque volume peut se vendre separément.

DISPUTATIONES THEOLOGICAE seu Commentaria in Summam Theologicam D. Thomae. De Sacramentis (Secunda pars) necnon De Novissimis. Auctore Aloisio-Adulpho Paquet. Quebeci: S.-A. Demers; Romae et Neo-Eboraci: Fr. Pustet; Neo-Eboraci: Benziger. 1903. Pp. 572.

THE STORY OF JESUS CHRIST. By Ambrose Adams. Boston: Marlier & Co., Ltd. 1903. Pp. 271. Price, $0.50.

SALVAGE FROM THE WRECK. A Few Memories of Friends Departed Preserved in Funeral Discourses. By Father Gallwey, S.J. New edition, enlarged. London: Art Book Co., 22 Paternoster Row. MDCCCCIII. Pp. xxvi—427. Price, $1.00 *net.*

THE SERVER'S MANUAL. A Compendium (Prepared for Lay Servers) of the Rites and Ceremonies to be Observed in the Services of the Church. By John Loughlin, Master of Ceremonies, St. Anne's Priory, Liverpool. London: Burns and Oates, Limited; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 72. Price, $0.60 *net.*

UNDER THE CROSS. Selections from *The Foot of the Cross.* By Father Faber. Edited by J. B. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1903. Pp. 166. Price, $0.60 *net.*

THE CITY OF PEACE. By Those Who Have Entered It. Published for the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, by Sealy, Bryers and Walker; Dublin, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. viii—149. Price, $0.90 *net.*

NE OBLIVISCARIS. A Daily Reminder of our Dead. Compiled by Florence Ratcliff. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London: Sands & Co. 1903. Pp. viii—190. Price, $0.75, *net.*

A SHORT CATECHISM OF CATHOLIC TEACHING IN REFERENCE TO THE RELIGIOUS LIFE, for the Use of Nuns, Novices and Postulants. By His Eminence Cardinal Svampa, Archbishop of Bologna. Translated from the Italian. (Second Edition, revised and enlarged by the Author.) By a Priest of the Diocese of Dublin. Pp. 45.

BACK TO ROME! Being a Series of Private Letters, etc., addressed to an Anglican Clergyman, by "Scrutator." St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London: Sands & Co. 1903. Pp. 224. Price, $1.00 *net.*

CHRISTIAN ASPECT OF THE LABOR QUESTION. By the Right Rev. Abbot Snow, O.S.B. Catholic Truth Society. Pp. 32.

PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION.

COMPENDIUM PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE ad Mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis. a Fr. Joanne Lottini, Ordinis Praedicatorum, Philos. Lectore in Sem. Ep. Faesulano Editum. Volumen I. Logica, Metaphisica Generalis et Cosmologia. Volumen II. Anthropologia, Theologia Naturalis et Ethica. Florentiae Typis S. Joseph olim Eq. A Ciardi. 1900. Pp. iv—458. Paris: (VIe) P. Lethielleux, Libraire, Editeur, 10, Rue Cassette, 10. 1903. Pp. viii—457.

ESSAIS DE PHILOSOPHIE RELIGIEUSE. Par le P. L. Laberthonnière, de l'Oratoire. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1903. Pp. 330. Prix, 3.50 francs.

PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE IN TAXATION. Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University. Volume XVII. Number 2. By Stephen F. Weston, Ph.D., President of Antioch College, sometime University Fellow in Finance. New York: The Columbia University Press (The Macmillan Company, Agents); London: P. S. King & Son. 1903. Pp. 299.

A DREAM OF REALMS BEYOND US. By Adair Welcker. Sixth Separate American Edition. San Francisco: Cubery & Co. 1903. Pp. 30.

JESUIT EDUCATION. Its History and Principles Viewed in the Light of Modern Educational Problems. By Robert Schwickerath, S.J., Woodstock College, Md. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. xv—687. Price, $1.75 *net.*

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY. Reminiscences of the First Twenty-five Years. M. P. Dowling, S.J. Omaha: Press of Burkley Printing Company. 1903. Pp. 251. Price, $1.25.

HAVE WE THE LIKENESS OF CHRIST? By Franklin Johnson, Professor of Church History and Homiletics. (The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, founded by John D. Rockefeller.) Printed from Volume II. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1902. Pp. 23. Price, $0.50 *net.*